ΠΙΝΔΑΡΟΥ ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΙ ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙΣ.

THE

# ISTHMIAN ODES

OF

# PINDAR

ΠΙΝΔΑΡΟΥ ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΙ ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙΣ.

THE

# ISTHMIAN ODES

OF

# PINDAR

EDITED WITH

INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTARY

BY

J. B. BURY, M.A.,

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN,
EDITOR OF THE NEMEAN ODES OF PINDAR.

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
AND NEW YORK.
1892

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A., AND SONS,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

# PREFACE.

THOSE critics who disapproved of the theory of verbal responsions, which formed an express feature in my edition of the Nemean Odes, may not be pleased at seeing that aid, as I conceive it, to interpretation reappearing in this edition of the Isthmian, which is planned on the same lines. But they will find that this "perilous stuff" has been more seldom introduced into the commentary, in deference to the judgment both of those who are entirely deaf to the echoes, and of those who, though willing to allow that such echoes are sometimes audible, think that I have carried the method to extremes.

While I readily admit that in many particular cases I may have pressed into the service of interpretation resemblances which may be no more than fortuitous coincidences, I still think that word-signals were used by Pindar and are often *κρυπταὶ κλαῖδες* to the arguments of his hymns. The chief objections, which have been urged by some of my learned reviewers against the theory, were foreseen and therefore less disconcerting. On some future occasion I hope to consider them at length. But there is an important distinction touching these signals which I omitted to draw before and on which a few remarks will be in place here.

The following question may be asked. Were the signals intended to be audible,—like the rhythm itself for example; or were they a secret writing, meant only for the interpreter, and to be discarded, like a scaffolding, when the riddle of the ode was read? Some responsions could hardly escape the notice of the most casual listener, and these were assuredly intended to be noticed. But in regard to the great number, it must be said

that they are invisible signals which the student discovers only by curious attention and which do not, and are not meant to, contribute to the artistic effect of the poem. If any one denies their existence, explaining them as freaks of chance, we have of course no absolute proof to offer. This lies in the nature of all questions of intention. Nothing short of an express declaration from Pindar himself or one of his contemporaries could settle the question definitively. The probability of the theory rests on the occurrence of echoes which might reasonably be intentional signals in every ode, and the fact that they have in many cases suggested satisfactory solutions of the difficulties which had hitherto beset the arguments. But it may be shewn further that the conditions under which Pindar's lyric poetry was produced were not unfavourable to the employment of what might be called invisible signals.

Readers of Pindar, puzzled to find their way through the "dedal" chambers, as he might have said himself, of an epinician palace, must have often wondered whether the Aeginetan or the Sicilian victor was able to trace the thought and comprehend the argument without a clew or a guide. The contemporary doubtless could perceive at once special allusions which escape us; but if we were told that the Greeks themselves did not find the same difference in difficulty as we between an ode of Pindar and, say, an ode of Euripides, the tale would pass our belief. We cannot imagine that the applications of the myths, in which Boeckh and his successors have found such serious difficulties, were obvious by the light of nature to the quires who sang the odes, or to the audience whom the music charmed.

It would be perverse to suppose that, because hymns were sung at festive meetings and appreciated by the people, the trains of thought were therefore easy for a casual listener to follow. Even for a modern reader the charm of Pindar's Odes does not depend on his comprehension of their arguments; much less can it have been so for those who heard them sung to music by young men dancing. The cadences of the lofty rhyme, the succession of pictures which are called up before the eyes, the echoes of Delphic wisdom,—like some rich but temperate harmony of sound and colour,—may enchant one, at the first vision, into forgetting every curious question of argument and unity. But

in the end one must come to analyse; and it may safely be held that the analysis was not, generally, self-evident to the contemporaries of Pindar. The epinician odes required some exposition then as well as now.

And the exposition of his hymns devolved upon the poet himself. It must not be forgotten that Pindar did not compose like a modern lyrist, who writes with regard only to the sense and sound of the words[1]. He might rather be compared to the ideal composer of operas, who should be at once a poet and a musician, and a master of orchestric effects. In building up his elaborate odes at Thebes, he had to combine, under the guidance of a sovran rhythm, the words, the music, and the motions of the dance. His fabric of song arose, like the Theban walls themselves, stone by vocal stone, to the sound of lyres and flutes; and the verses, as he set them, vibrated to the fall of dancers' feet. And this harmony of the Arts, which was wrought out in his imagination, was to be realised under his direction. The poet was not merely required to compose the hymn; he was expected to train the chorus and preside at the performance[2]. In the case of his own presence being rendered impossible by other engagements, it was incumbent on him to provide and instruct a competent chorodidaskalos and choregos to take his place. The chorus which performed the First Isthmian at Thebes probably studied their parts under the guidance of Pindar himself; but the Second Isthmian was sent to Thrasybulus by the hands of one Nicasippus. A full explanation of the argument of an ode, necessary to its intelligent performance, must have been one of the first things that the teacher of a chorus had to

[1] The expression ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι (*Ol.* II. 1) is sometimes quoted to prove that the music was subordinate to the words. But the received rendering of this expression is erroneous. It assuredly does not mean "hymns lords of the lyre," but "hymns that awaken the lyre." According to the laws of Greek composition ἀναξιφόρμιγξ can come from ἀνάγω just as well as from ἀνάσσω, and that it does come from ἀνάγω is confirmed by the only other compound of the kind, ἀναξιδώρα, an epithet of Demeter preserved by Hesychius and explained ἡ ἀνάγουσα δῶρα. For ἀνάγειν "awaken," it is enough to cite *Isth.* III. (B) 22 ἐκ λεχέων ἀνάγει φάμαν παλαιάν, and *Isth.* V. 62 ἀνὰ δ' ἄγαγον ἐς φάος οἵαν μοῖραν ὕμνων. The figure of awakening the lyre is familiar; I need only refer to *Nem.* X. 21 ἔγειρε λύραν (*suscita lyram*).

[2] In fact chorodidaskalos was almost equivalent to a lyric poet. Cp. the admirable exposition of A. Croiset, *La poésie de Pindare*, p. 96.

impart. There was no difficulty in this, when the odes were sung under the direct supervision of Pindar or a substitute whom he instructed. But how was the key to those things which needed exposition to be handed down after the death of the composer? The same question met workers in another art, the painters of vases, whose pictures frequently required some explanation of the subject. They solved it by the device of introducing into the picture itself the names of the figures. We thus learn who each figure is, but once we have grasped the subject, we take no more thought of the letters and ignore their presence on the clay. The names are in the picture, but not of it. In the same way it might have seemed desirable to make provision for transmitting the interpretation of hymns, in which the bearings of the myth were not always evident even at the second glance,—nay were sometimes, one might think, scrupulously concealed,—through some device of clews or hints, contained in the poem itself yet not belonging to it, like the names of the vase-figures. The echoes I suppose to have been such a device, intended to assist the study of the odes and as a technical aid to memory, yet not supposed to be there. It is as if the architect of some building of complicated structure inscribed clews to the symmetry of his design, small letters or signs on certain stones, only visible when you came quite close, and forming no part of the design itself. We are to set aside the invisible sign, when we have made use of it in close quarters, and, remembering only what we have learned from it, step back again to view the whole structure in the new light. For example in the ode to Herodotus (*Isthmian* I.) the signal of ἀλιϝερκέα (V. 9) to ἁλός in the same metrical place (V. 37) suggests that the victory of Herodotus in the games of the Sea-god is to be set beside the misfortune of his father's ships on the ocean. Securing this idea, but discarding from our minds the signal which called our attention to it, we read the poem again; and its motive, the victory of the Theban charioteer, wins a new feature, as a compensation for the father's calamity granted by Poseidon to the son. But these invisible signs must be distinguished from signs written large, which strike the eye at a distance, as pleasing details in the artistic structure. It requires no curious study to notice in the Sixth Isthmian that the same word is used of the

death of Strepsiades at Tanagra—*εὐανθέ᾽ ἀπέπνευσας ἁλικίαν*—and of the garland which his nephew hoped to win at the Pythian games—*στέφανον εὐανθέα.* Here the echo, suggesting a contrast between the "crown of death" and the "crown of victory," as we might attempt to render it in English, is a distinct grace in the poem.

But even if it be conceded that the signals are there and that they were put there as a help to tracing out the argument of the hymns,—as a technical help to chorodidaskaloi and choregoi—it is impossible for a modern inquirer to be always sure. that he spells them aright. The interpretations which Mezger or I have ventured to base on them are only first attempts to read the secret writing; and, for my part, I am far indeed from supposing that the views which I put forward as to the arguments could be more than preliminary essays, full of defects. Nor is it likely that the question will ever be decided with certainty. But this is one of the charms in the study of Pindar, as in the study of Homer or of Plato; nothing is final.

There is another point on which I wish to make an observation. Mr Morshead, my reviewer in the *Academy*, took me to task for misrepresenting the spirit of Pindar's poetry. I am sorry if I failed to express my meaning. I certainly never meant that Pindar was not, like all the Greek poets, conscious of the pathos of life. On the contrary, I even spoke of "a resigned pessimism" in connexion with the Eleventh Nemean. One is driven to use the inappropriate terms "pessimism" or "melancholy," which inevitably suggest moods of a spirit that is not Greek. In his recent work *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius,* Mr Butcher has a suggestive essay on "the Melancholy of the Greeks." But we must always remember that it was the "melancholy" *of the Greeks.* The words of Mimnermus

> *ἀλλ᾽ ὀλιγοχρόνιον γίγνεται ὥσπερ ὄναρ*
> *ἥβη τιμήεσσα*

are gloomy, but not with the intenser gloom of the reflection that "the world passeth away and the lust thereof"; nor is Pindar's subtler refinement of the same figure,

> *ἐπάμεροι· τί δέ τις; τί δ᾽ οὔ τις; σκιᾶς ὄναρ*
> *ἄνθρωπος,*

touched with the modern pathos of Swinburne's

> "His life is a watch or a vision
> Between a sleep and a sleep."

In Pindar's verse, indeed, the shadow of the thought has no sooner fallen than it is effaced by a celestial radiance, **αἴγλα διόσδοτος**. Pindar felt as deeply as the singer of "golden Aphrodite" the transience of life; he too had his fits of **δυσθυμία**—of "melancholy" if you will. But what I wished to recognize and endeavoured to express was the note of **ἀγλαΐα** which distinguishes him, even among the poets of Greece. He seems to come always with the Graces, cheerfully,—*σὺν Χάρισιν ἔμολον* as he once says. And he makes us fancy him as living in a bright place—the light reasonably tempered by thoughts of death coming in rarely, at pensive moments, and only making life seem the more precious,—and enjoying, as a being in full harmony with its environment, the daily transient pleasures, not spoiled for him by their brevity,—*ὅ τι τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον διώκων*, a natural, unconscious Cyrenaic.

As I may not soon again have an opportunity of going back on the *Nemean Odes*, I may note here some second thoughts which have since occurred or been suggested to me.

In the epodes of *Nem.* I. I should now give five verses instead of four, the second consisting in each case of the trisyllabic word which now stands at the end of the first (15 *ἀφνεαῖς*, 34 *προφρόνως*, 51 *ἀθρόοι*, 69 *ἐν σχερῷ*). This change solves the difficulty of the lengthening of *ον* in *ἔδραμον* and *χρόνον* in 51 and 69. See Boehmer, *Pindars Sicilische Oden* (p. xi.). Similarly in VI., the first three syllables of the 5th line of each strophe and ant. should be printed as a separate verse; we thus get rid of the difficulty (*τήλοθεν ὄνομ'*) in l. 49. (So Boehmer.)—On I. 54 I should have quoted Theognis 656 *ἀλλά τοι ἀλλότριον κῆδος ἐφημέριον*.—I. 72 I should now read *δόμον* with the MSS.—II. 14 I believe that Mr Monro's solution (after a scholium) is the right one (*Classical Review*, February, 1892).—III. 22 In a new edition of the text I should adopt Mr Postgate's *ἥρῳ* which seems to me certain.—III. 56 It is possible that *ἀγλαόκαρνον* may be right, preserving an old form of *κράνα* (cp. *κάρα* : *κρᾶς*) as Dr E. Schmidt suggests in a paper on this

ode (*de Pind. Carm. Nem. tertio*, 1891). I am glad to see that Schmidt, unlike Boehmer, leaves the Myrmidons their ancient agora in l. 14.—IV. 35 νεομηνίᾳ. Nissen conjectures a reference to a victory at the summer Heraea of Argos, held at the new moon of Panemos. The Heraea were a sort of "Vorfeier" of the Nemea (*Ueber Tempel-Orientirung*, *Rhein. Mus.*, N. F., XL. p. 367).—IV. 68 I have to thank Mr Sandys for the comparison of Catullus, 64, 303 *sqq.*, in illustration of ἐξύφαναν.—V. 43 I must retract my approval of Mezger's Ἰσθμοῖ τε founded on a scholium. See my note on *Isth.* V. 61.—VI. 18 I am inclined to think Mr Fennell's conjecture ἐπάρκεσ' may be right. The word occurs also in l. 60 of this ode, and not elsewhere in Pindar.—VII. 105 I should have cited Sappho's μαψυλάκαν γλῶσσαν, as Mr W. R. Hardie reminded me.—IX. 17 Boehmer has made an admirable correction in this passage. He reads

Δαναῶν ἔσσαν μέγιστοι. καί ποτε
ἐσ<λὸν ἐς> ἑπταπύλους Θήβας ἄγαγον στρατὸν ἀνδρῶν κ.τ.λ.

—23 I should have quoted in support of my explanation of νόστον ἐρεισάμενοι the Homeric expression τοῦ γε θεοὶ κατὰ νόστον ἔδησαν (ξ 61). ἐρεισάμενοι is almost equivalent to καταδησάμενοι.—*ib.* Mr A. C. Pearson has given new point to the epithet λευκανθέα by referring it to the white shields of the Argives, cp. Soph. *Ant.* 106. (*Class. Review*, July 1891.)—X. 5 On the conjecture Ἰώ in this verse, which I still hold to notwithstanding the objections which have been raised, I shall have something to say in the *Introduction* p. xxxviii.—X. 48 There is a mistake (due to myself, not to the press) in the text. I meant to print θῆκεν δόμῳ. θῆκε is unmetrical, as my reviewer in the *Speaker* pointed out, but he was hardly fair in stating that I objected to δρόμῳ in itself; my objection was to παρ δρόμῳ. I am sorry, however, that I altered the text.

Of works which have recently appeared on Pindar I have already referred to Boehmer's excellent edition of Pindar's Sicilian and Epizephyrian Odes, which contains a valuable preface on the laws of rhythm (to which I shall refer again in the *Introduction*); and to Schmidt's commentary on the Third Nemean. I had not consulted Christ's paper *Zur Chronologie*

*pindarischer Siegesgesänge* (in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Bavarian Academy, 1889) until the commentary on the Isthmian Odes was printed, but I was able to make use of it for the *Introduction*. Herbig's tract, *Zur Chronologie der pindarischen Siegesgesänge, Isth.* iii. iv. *und Isth.* vii., and Hümmerich's *Die Pindar-Handschriften B und D in Nem. und Isth.*, came too late. Hümmerich's results are in general accordance with the view expressed on p. xxxvi. of my *Introduction*. The most important point in Herbig's paper is that both *Isth.* III. (B) and *Isth.* VII. may belong to the same year 478, Cleander having been the victor in the boys', Melissus in the men's pancration. I believe that Signor Fraccaroli of Messina, an excellent Pindaric scholar (as I discovered from his very severe criticism of my *Nemean Odes*), has published some papers in some journal on *Pyth.* VI. and *Isth.* II. I regret that I have not seen them.

I have again to thank Mr Tyrrell for his kind help in revising the proof sheets. Only those who have had books printed at the Cambridge Press can appreciate how much both this volume and my *Nemean Odes* are indebted to the accurate scholarship and scrupulous care of the learned staff of Messrs Clay.

*pindarischer Siegesgesänge* (in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Bavarian Academy, 1889) until the commentary on the Isthmian Odes was printed, but I was able to make use of it for the *Introduction*. Herbig's tract, *Zur Chronologie der pindarischen Siegesgesänge, Isth.* iii. iv. *und Isth.* vii., and Hümmerich's *Die Pindar-Handschriften B und D in Nem. und Isth.*, came too late. Hümmerich's results are in general accordance with the view expressed on p. xxxvi. of my *Introduction*. The most important point in Herbig's paper is that both *Isth.* III. (B) and *Isth.* VII. may belong to the same year 478, Cleander having been the victor in the boys', Melissus in the men's pancration. I believe that Signor Fraccaroli of Messina, an excellent Pindaric scholar (as I discovered from his very severe criticism of my *Nemean Odes*), has published some papers in some journal on *Pyth.* VI. and *Isth.* II. I regret that I have not seen them.

I have again to thank Mr Tyrrell for his kind help in revising the proof sheets. Only those who have had books printed at the Cambridge Press can appreciate how much both this volume and my *Nemean Odes* are indebted to the accurate scholarship and scrupulous care of the learned staff of Messrs Clay.

# INTRODUCTION.

THE collection of the seven or eight odes of Pindar which celebrate Isthmian victors,—on the whole perhaps not so striking as the Nemean, Olympian or Pythian groups, though certainly not less artistic in form than they,—possesses, accidentally of course, a special interest, from the fact that all the hymns with two exceptions point, as it were, beyond themselves, referring to other poems, already composed or destined in hope to be composed at a future time. Thus the First Isthmian took Pindar away, by its higher claim, from the composition of a Paean, completed doubtless afterwards but lost along with his other works of that kind in the scattering of Greek literature, so that it only remains for us to wonder whether he will refer in the Paean backward to the ode of victory, as in it he refers forward to the Paean. The meaning of the curious hymn, which comes second in order, addressed to Thrasybulus of Acragas, is missed, if one does not hold the clew,—its connexion with another hymn, addressed long ago to the same person, then in his early youth, and luckily, being an epinician, preserved to us among the Pythians. Again the two odes in honour of Phylacidas look mutually toward each other,—the Fifth, first in date though second in the traditional arrangement, looking forward to the Fourth, the Fourth in turn looking back to the Fifth; while both look back further still to the Nemean ode which celebrated Pytheas. The Third Isthmian, which consists of two parts composed on different occasions but meant to be united and so skilfully fitted together that many will not recognize the seam, likewise affords a case of a poem which in some measure goes out beyond itself,—here however only to lose itself in a larger unity.

Another point of interest in the Isthmians is that some of Pindar's most striking references to contemporary events are to be found in them. The Second, connected with the history of Acragas and written just after "the light of the Acragantines" had set, derives an historical

*pindarischer Siegesgesänge* (in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Bavarian Academy, 1889) until the commentary on the Isthmian Odes was printed, but I was able to make use of it for the *Introduction*. Herbig's tract, *Zur Chronologie der pindarischen Siegesgesänge, Isth.* iii. iv. *und Isth.* vii., and Hümmerich's *Die Pindar-Handschriften B und D in Nem. und Isth.*, came too late. Hümmerich's results are in general accordance with the view expressed on p. xxxvi. of my *Introduction*. The most important point in Herbig's paper is that both *Isth.* III. (B) and *Isth.* VII. may belong to the same year 478, Cleander having been the victor in the boys', Melissus in the men's pancration. I believe that Signor Fraccaroli of Messina, an excellent Pindaric scholar (as I discovered from his very severe criticism of my *Nemean Odes*), has published some papers in some journal on *Pyth.* VI. and *Isth.* II. I regret that I have not seen them.

I have again to thank Mr Tyrrell for his kind help in revising the proof sheets. Only those who have had books printed at the Cambridge Press can appreciate how much both this volume and my *Nemean Odes* are indebted to the accurate scholarship and scrupulous care of the learned staff of Messrs Clay.

# INTRODUCTION.

THE collection of the seven or eight odes of Pindar which celebrate Isthmian victors,—on the whole perhaps not so striking as the Nemean, Olympian or Pythian groups, though certainly not less artistic in form than they,—possesses, accidentally of course, a special interest, from the fact that all the hymns with two exceptions point, as it were, beyond themselves, referring to other poems, already composed or destined in hope to be composed at a future time. Thus the First Isthmian took Pindar away, by its higher claim, from the composition of a Paean, completed doubtless afterwards but lost along with his other works of that kind in the scattering of Greek literature, so that it only remains for us to wonder whether he will refer in the Paean backward to the ode of victory, as in it he refers forward to the Paean. The meaning of the curious hymn, which comes second in order, addressed to Thrasybulus of Acragas, is missed, if one does not hold the clew,—its connexion with another hymn, addressed long ago to the same person, then in his early youth, and luckily, being an epinician, preserved to us among the Pythians. Again the two odes in honour of Phylacidas look mutually toward each other,—the Fifth, first in date though second in the traditional arrangement, looking forward to the Fourth, the Fourth in turn looking back to the Fifth; while both look back further still to the Nemean ode which celebrated Pytheas. The Third Isthmian, which consists of two parts composed on different occasions but meant to be united and so skilfully fitted together that many will not recognize the seam, likewise affords a case of a poem which in some measure goes out beyond itself,—here however only to lose itself in a larger unity.

Another point of interest in the Isthmians is that some of Pindar's most striking references to contemporary events are to be found in them. The Second, connected with the history of Acragas and written just after "the light of the Acragantines" had set, derives an historical

interest from the fact that it was composed at that moment. In the Fourth are found the strong words,—strong in one sense, reserved in another,—about the battle of Salamis, which do not, indeed, stand alone in showing how Pindar regarded the repulse of Asia by the Greek "Sailors." For the Seventh is inspired by a feeling of positive and unfeigned relief at the deliverance of Greece from that Eastern terror, imminent so long "like a stone of Tantalus." The Third has been thought to contain an allusion to the battle of Plataea,—in a similar spirit of relief, as of one greeting the coming of a bright spring, with flowers, after the gloom of winter; but it is possible that some lesser deliverance, rather, a special deliverance of Thebes, is meant[1]. The Sixth records the memory of a Theban warrior who fell, fighting among the front fighters, on some Boeotian field of battle, which one would like to recognize under one of the familiar names of the battles in the middle of the fifth century. Interesting as all these hymns are in many ways, the three Aeginetan are perhaps more interesting than the rest.

No less than eleven of the Epinician Odes celebrate Aeginetan victors, and of these, three are Isthmian and six Nemean. In connexion with this gallery of Aeginetan portraits, it may be well here to call to recollection the early history of Aegina; and the following pages may be regarded as also an appendix to my edition of the Nemeans.

## I.

## AEGINA.

Passing over the mythical story of the island, called Oenone, as Pindar sometimes reminds us, until the nymph Aegina, settled there by Zeus to bring forth Aeacus, gave her home a new name, and beginning in the region of fact, we find that the Aeginetan polis owed its origin to colonists from "vineclad" Epidaurus on the opposite mainland. Both mother city and colony came under the empire of that early tyrant whose date is so uncertain, Phidon of Argos, but after his death gained the independence of free Dorian cities. Of the islands on the east coast of Greece the rocky and barren Aegina was marked out to play a prominent part, like Corcyra—her sister, according to one legend[2]—

[1] Christ however holds that the allusion is to Plataea, in his recent investigation of Pindar's chronology (*Sitzungsberichte* of Munich Academy, 1889; p. 30). He accepts the view of Bulle as to the two odes for Melissus, which I put forward without knowledge of Bulle's tracts; and would place *Isth.* IV. (III. B) in 476, *Isth.* III. (III. A) in 475.

[2] The men of Phlius said that Corcyra was the eldest daughter of the river-god Asopus, father of Aegina and Theba.

among the islands on the west, in early Hellenic history. As Corcyra soon freed herself from the influence of Corinth, Aegina soon became independent of Epidaurus. The relations of the Argive city with her neighbouring daughter seem, for a time at least, to have been somewhat like those of the city of the Isthmus with her distant daughter. Herodotus in relating the origin of the old feud between Aegina and Athens, brought about by an act of violence on the part of the Aeginetans towards the Epidaurians, notes the change in the piety of the colony as her power increased[1]. The power of Aegina overshadowed Epidaurus; the power of Corcyra was never more than that of a dangerous rival to Corinth. But while that rivalry led to a bitter and constant enmity, Aegina seems, at a later period, to have been on good terms with her mother, the venerable city of Asclepius; and there may be some significance in the fact that the three victors, whom Pindar mentions, in the quadriennial games of Asclepius at Epidaurus, were Aeginetans[2]. It is to be observed that Aegina in old days naturally went with the southern mainland, Pausanias the traveller, for example, including it in his account of Argolis. But in later times it went with the northern mainland. Under the Eastern Roman Empire it belonged to the Theme of "Hellas," not to the Theme of the Peloponnesus; and now under the Greek kingdom it goes with the northern mainland, being a nome in the eparchia of "Attica and Boeotia." The sisters Theba and Aegina have been, in a fashion, united.

The island under a Dorian constitution, which, especially perhaps in its Aeginetan form, Pindar regarded as the ideal shape of government, grew rapidly in wealth and power, and enjoyed apparently almost unbroken peace during the seventh and sixth centuries, so that it was in a true sense the special home of Hesychia, whom Pindar calls on—"φιλόφρον 'Ασυχία"—as "mother of justice, queen of an exceeding great city," to receive the glory of an Aeginetan who came home crowned from Pytho. The ships of Aegina went east and west, bearing bronze wares and vessels of pottery, to the furthest climes of those days, to the land of the Rhone and the land of the Nile, to the pillars of

[1] V. 83 *τοῦτον δ' ἔτι τὸν χρόνον καὶ τὸν πρὸ τούτου Αἰγινῆται Ἐπιδαυρίων ἤκουον τά τε ἄλλα καὶ δίκας διαβαίνοντες ἐς Ἐπίδαυρον ἐδίδοσάν τε καὶ ἐλάμβανον παρ' ἀλλήλων οἱ Αἰγινῆται. τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦδε νέας τε πηξάμενοι καὶ ἀγνωμοσύνῃ χρησάμενοι ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἐπιδαυρίων.*

[2] *Nem.* III. 84, V. 52, *Isth.* VII. 75.—Nissen (*Ueber Tempel-Orientirung*, in *Rhein. Mus.*, N. F., XLII. p. 46) determines that the Asclepiad festival was held in the 2nd year of each Olympiad, nine days after the Isthmia, on the 17th of April.

Heracles and the Phasis. The wide diffusion of her coins, stamped with the tortoise, still testifies to the extent of her trade.

But the people of this rich city had their enemies. If their southern neighbours of Argolis were friendly, envious glances were cast at them by their neighbours on the north. There was an old feud between Athens and Aegina, destined in the curious ways of history to lead to the greatness of the Athenian state, perhaps to the salvation of Greece, and thereby even to affect the destinies of Europe. By that geographical necessity, which in politics is imperative, an ambitious city in Attica was doomed to collide with Aegina, just as, to compare a case on a larger scale, an ambitious city in Italy was doomed to interfere with Sicily. That homely, telling expression "the eye-sore of Piraeus" becomes more significant when one realizes "the conspicuous island," *διαπρεπέα νᾶσον*, as Pindar called it[1], perhaps not only in a figurative sense but to suggest a physical feature, the preeminence of its high Mountain,—the Ὄρος—far seen in the bay and ranging above the other hills of the neighbouring coasts and islands.

Towards the close of the sixth century Aegina was drawn into the war which was then being waged between Thebes and Athens. The men of Thebes sought the aid of the island. For receiving from the Delphic god the obscure counsel that they would do well to turn in their need to "those nearest to them," they interpreted the oracle in the light of the myth that the nymphs Aegina and Theba were sisters, daughters of Asopus and Metopa. Pindar, very young at the time when these things befel, was afterwards fond of dwelling on the common origin of the two cities through the sisterhood of their eponymous foundresses, and would put it forward as a link binding a Theban in a friendly bond with Aeginetans. That historical occasion must have brought home to him the legend with a special force; and a man of Thebes or of Aegina would assuredly think of that passage in the history of his city when lines like these were sung to him:

> *χρὴ δ' ἐν ἑπταπύλοις Θήβαις τραφέντα*
> *Αἰγίνᾳ Χαρίτων ἄωτον προνέμειν,*
> *πατρὸς οὕνεκα δίδυμαι γένοντο θύγατρες Ἀσωπίδων*
> *ὁπλόταται, Ζηνί τε Ϝάδον βασιλέϊ*[2].

To the request of the Thebans, founded on myth, the answer which Aegina sent back was also of mythical kind, even "the Aeacid heroes," ancient and precious images of them, no doubt,—wooden *ξόανα*, one may imagine, very rudely fashioned, but too sacred for the more

[1] *Isth.* IV. 44.  [2] *Isth.* VII. 17 *sqq.*

developed, perhaps profaner, skill attained by newer artists, Smilis or Callon, to renew or improve. The virtue of these images, supposed to be an efficient aid in time of danger, securing the supernatural presence and power of the heroes themselves for those whom they chose to succour, was approved afterwards on a far more pressing occasion; but this time the divine warriors did not avail. In compliance with a second supplication, the Aeginetan government, then at peace with Athens, nevertheless began hostilities, without even a formal declaration of their intention, by plundering the Attic coast in their triremes, so as to divert part of the Athenian power from the operations in Boeotia. The dislike of oligarchs for a democracy, the disdain of Dorians for Ionians, doubtless made them willing enough to listen to the request of Thebes.

The war seems to have been protracted in a desultory manner and without any important events—our historians at least have recorded no details—for about fifteen years, until in 492 the threat of the Persian invasion interrupted the current of Greek politics. It was a moment which claimed that the Greeks should look away from all smaller questions of jealousy and rivalry among themselves to consider the great question between Hellene and Barbarian—the eternal controversy before Europe and Asia, an issue which made them all more fully conscious of their own unity as Hellenic brethren. To this, her first opportunity to win a noble place in ecumenical history, Athens proved herself equal; her rival missed the chance. Aegina is conspicuous among the few who "betrayed Hellas,"—a significant expression, as Grote has well brought out, coming into use at that momentous time. When the envoys of the great king demanded earth and water, they assuredly did not forget to point out to the Aeginetan oligarchs that the hated city across the waters was the chief object of their master's wrath. But if, in the first surprise, Aegina, like her sister Theba, forgot Hellas in her enmity to Athens, she was afterwards nobly and fully to redeem her fault.

The recognized leaders of Greece, the Spartans, on the representation of Athens that Aegina was "medizing," interfered to hinder her from helping the Persians, if they could not force her to help the Greeks. The kings of Sparta, Cleomenes and Leotychides, invaded Aegina, and having secured ten citizens, delivered them to the Athenians as hostages, so that Athens had no fear of hostilities in her rear when she met the great enemy at Marathon. It was probably at this time that Pindar wrote a poem for a Nemean victory in the foot-race won by an Aeginetan, named Deinis, and took the opportunity of reminding the

islanders, at this moment of humiliation, of the mythical days of king Aeacus, when the princes of Sparta and the "host"—not then a democracy—of Athens hung upon his words. Parts have been changed since then. Aegina has to "obey the commands" of Athens and Sparta[1].

When the danger was over, the strife between Athens and Aegina was renewed and went on during the years intervening between the expedition sent by Darius and the invasion of Xerxes. This struggle was the making of Athens. It taught her and her statesman Themistocles the importance of the ships which were to prove her wooden wall. And in this way Aegina contributed, against her will, to the salvation of Greece; "this war," as Herodotus observed, "saved Hellas, compelling the Athenians to become a sea-power." After the death of Cleomenes, under sad and discreditable circumstances, the Aeginetans complained at Sparta respecting the behaviour of him and his surviving colleague Leotychides in seizing the ten hostages. The complaint availed, as far as Sparta was concerned. Leotychides accompanied the Aeginetan ambassadors to Athens, in order to get the hostages restored. But the Athenians, glad to keep the hostages as a security against the aggression of Aegina, refused on the technical ground that, as the two kings had made the deposit, one alone could not claim it. Then the Aeginetans waiting their opportunity surprised a sacred vessel of the Athenians, and made captives of those on board. These proceedings began the war. In its course the constitution of Aegina was threatened by a domestic conspiracy formed by one Nicodromus, a citizen who had been banished by the government and wished to overthrow it, in order, doubtless, to establish a tyranny for himself. He excited a revolt among the people, and secured the cooperation of the enemy. The success of his attempt was frustrated by a delay which prevented the Athenians from arriving at the right time. Nicodromus and his partisans seized, as had been agreed beforehand, the "Old Town," ἡ παλαιὰ πόλις. One wonders whether it was in this quarter that the ancient agora of the Myrmidons—παλαίφατον ἀγοράν[2],—mentioned by Pindar, lay. The conspirators could not maintain their position against the forces of the government, without the help of their foreign allies, and the end was

[1] Christ however (*Zur Chronologie pindarischer Siegesgesänge*, in the Munich *Sitzungsberichte*, 1889) objects (p. 40) to this view of Mezger on the ground that *Nem.* VIII. must have been composed in the poet's old age (cp. ll. 35—39). He would put it before the rising of Aegina against Athens (459), either in 461 or 463.

[2] *Nem.* III. 14. But metrical authorities wish to "amend" this bit of topography. See below p. xxxvii.

that the leader fled from the island, and seven hundred of his supporters were executed. Nicodromus interests us as a candidate for the tyrannis in the πόλις εὔνομος which never fell under the rule of despots.

It is unnecessary to follow further the course of the war, in which if Athens had, on the whole, the advantage, no less did her adversary approve herself rich in men and ships—

εὔανδρόν τε καὶ ναυσὶ κλυτάν—

according to the prayer of the sons of Aeacus which they prayed by the altar of Zeus Hellanios, as we see them in a picture of Pindar, in his ode composed in some of those years for Pytheas the son of Lampon[1]. The war was interrupted by the second expedition of the Persians. When the heralds of the King came in 481 to demand the tokens of submission, Aegina did not betray Greece. She took part in that Panhellenic congress—a new departure in Greek history—which assembled at Isthmus to consult on common measures for resisting the common foe. This time, she did not hold her private quarrel of more account than the national welfare, but consented to become reconciled to her enemy; and Athenian and Aeginetan united zealously in taking measures for the safety of Greece. It is interesting to observe that the sacred precincts of the Isthmian god were chosen as the place for the Greek states to meet in a common council. Naturally marked out by its central position on the "sea bridge" which joins northern Greece with the Peloponnesus, it was, although in Corinthian territory—πρὸ Κορίνθου τειχέων—yet, as the seat of a national cult, more neutral ground than Corinth. To the renowned Dorian Isthmus, κλειτὰν Ἰσθμὸν Δωρίαν, the Dorian cities might send their delegates without reluctance; while Athens had from the first a special connexion with the place, possessing the proedria or right of occupying front seats at the biennial festival; a tradition even existing that Theseus had founded the games. There was a certain appropriateness too in making the pine grove of Poseidon the scene of deliberation on a resistance whose success was eminently to depend upon prowess on his special element.

In the "Medic" war, which brought out the best and the worst qualities both in states and individuals—some striving like Themistocles and Athens

> "in a general honest thought
> And common good to all,"

others thinking only of their own city—Aegina distinguished herself conspicuously. The Sailors of Greece, as Pindar might still call them[2],

[1] *Nem.* v. 9. [2] *Isth.* IV. 48, see note.

in compliment to their long supremacy at sea, although Athens had just begun to outdo them in naval craft, played no small part at Artemisium and at Salamis. Of the three triremes sent forward to reconnoitre the movements of the enemy's fleet along the coast of Thessaly, one was an Aeginetan. It was captured by Persian vessels after a sore fight, and the name of one of the hoplites, Pythes, whose bravery was preeminent, has been preserved. In the story of Salamis Aegina's name constantly recurs. She had so cast aside her enmity with Athens that she gave refuge to the inhabitants of Attica when they retreated before the invader. On the eve of the battle, the presence of her heroes Aeacus and the Aeacids was demanded, and the trireme[1] which conveyed them arrived just in time to take its place in the line of the thirty Aeginetan vessels drawn up on the right wing. After the victory, when the spoils were divided, the Aeginetans were judged to have been bravest of all, and to them was assigned the best lot of the booty[2]; the Athenians took the second place.

Athens had her poet to celebrate the drama in which "Salamis" was the great episode; but Aegina like Sparta was never productive of literary talent. She could go, however, to her sister Theba for a poet, always willing to come from Boeotia, with the Graces who also had their chief home there by the waters of Cephisus, to the hospitable island where he had many friends. The Theban "wizard," though he loved Thebes, sympathized fully with the spirit of national patriotism evoked by the Persian danger[3]; and to express the sympathy without wounding his own city was a demand on his skill to which it was equal. In the second[4] of the two hymns in honour of Phylacidas the pancratiast, composed shortly after that memorable autumn, which thrilled the Greek world with a new experience, the part which Aegina played then is celebrated. The service of the "Sailors" at Salamis is openly

[1] The Aeginetans said that this trireme began the engagement, but the honour was disputed by the Athenians.

[2] It is related that while many gifts of thanksgiving were sent to the Delphian god, Aegina omitted this duty, but afterwards, on the complaint of the god, made an offering of four golden stars on a brazen staff.

[3] On Pindar's attitude to the Persian war Mr Fennell has made some remarks in connexion with *Pyth.* VI. and Professor Jebb in his essay on *Pindar*, p. 146. See also Croiset, *La poésie de Pindare*, p. 271.

[4] *Isth.* IV. Christ (*op. cit.*, pp. 36, 45) places *Nem.* V. in 483 B.C., *Isth.* V. in 480, and *Isth.* IV. as late as 476 (the Isthmian pancration in 478 having been won by Cleander, *Isth.* VII.). It is clear of course that *Isth.* IV. was not composed immediately after the Isth. games of 480, as Salamis was fought in autumn; but there is no reason to hinder our supposing that the ode was composed for a late celebration of a victory won in 480.

referred to, but other expressions and the myth, which concerns Aegina far more than the victor personally, show that Pindar's mind was full of the late achievements of his nation, in which his city had no share. No Aeginetan, assuredly, hearing this ode sung shortly after the Salaminian fight could fail at the emphatic words

οὐκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν

to remember how their heroes had sailed at the last moment to aid the Greek squadron;—"not without the Aeacids" was the battle won! Such language as

εἰ δὲ τέτραπται
θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἂν καθαράν

would come home with special force after the conduct of the island in the Persian invasion. The myth too was appropriate. The deeds of bravery which Aeginetan heroes had wrought long ago in the Trojan wars were the fitting parallel to the recent achievements of her warriors in the latest phase of the struggle between Europe and Asia. Pindar may not have been as fully alive as Herodotus to the continuity of history; but with artistic instinct seizing the parallel, which perhaps indeed was "in the air" at the time, he has brought mythical deeds of the Aeacids into a new impressive relation with the things which he and his hearers had themselves witnessed. Each land has its own brave men, he says; but Oenone—the name, a relic of prae-Aeacid days, which he is fond of calling to mind—has Aeacus and his sons, heroes of valiant heart, μεγαλήτορες ὀργαί, who twice sacked Troy[1].

δὶς πόλιν Τρώων πράθον, ἑσπόμενοι
Ἡρακλῆι πρότερον,
καὶ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις. ἔλα νῦν μοι πεδόθεν·
λέγε τίνες Κύκνον, τίνες Ἕκτορα πέφνον
καὶ στράταρχον Αἰθιόπων ἄφοβον
Μέμνονα χαλκοάραν; τίς ἄρ᾽ ἐσλὸν Τήλεφον
τρῶσεν ἐῷ δορὶ Καΐκου παρ᾽ ὄχθαις;

"Who slew Cycnus? who slew Hector? who Memnon? Who, by the banks of the Caicus, wounded Telephus?" And the answer is "Those who have Aegina to their country." The audience might be left to supply modern names,—the captains and sailors of valiant heart, among themselves, who had wrought this or that deed on the Salaminian waters.

[1] *Isth.* IV. 36 *sqq.*

> *καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἄρει*—the ode proceeds—*μαρτυρῆσαι κεν πόλις Αἴαντος ὀρθωθεῖσα ναύταις*
> *ἐν πολυφθόρῳ Σαλαμὶς Διὸς ὄμβρῳ*
> *ἀναρίθμων ἀνδρῶν χαλαζάεντι φόνῳ.*

The address too to the goddess Theia, with which the ode opens, on the ground that she inspires men with their esteem of gold—for the sake of which they undertake war by sea or land—might also have a fitness in the minds of the Aeginetans who had received the choice lot of the Persian spoils.

In this ode there was no place for a mention of the chief actors at Salamis, the Athenians. But Pindar has elsewhere[1] shown that he appreciated their services to Greece, speaking of them as the heroes of Salamis—as the Spartans were the heroes of Plataea and the Syracusans of Himera. To Pindar, a lover of Dorian institutions, no friend of democracy, the city of Solon and Clisthenes was not dear like his Aegina, but he respected, if he did not love, Athens of the great "polis," *μεγαλοπόλιες Ἀθᾶναι*[2], in the Panhellenic spirit which inspires his poetry. Nor was there any place for a direct mention of the great contest of Punic spears—*φοινικοστόλων ἐγχέων*[3],—which was deciding the fate of western Greece, at the same moment when the fate of eastern Greece was in the hands of her sailors. We cannot even be sure that the ode was not written before the news of the defeat and death of Hamilcar had reached Thebes. But Pindar at least knew that the Carthaginians were expected in Sicily and that a momentous issue was to be decided there as well as in the mother country. And there does certainly seem to be an allusion to Carthaginian warfare in the choice of war chariots as the type of battles by land[4].

To the final deliverance of Greece by the repulse of Mardonius, which was accomplished under the leadership of Pausanias at Plataea, the Aeginetans contributed five hundred hoplites. An ode, composed soon after this for Cleander of Aegina, commemorating his Isthmian victory and lamenting the death of his kinsman Nicocles who had fallen in battle—perhaps one of those five hundred, under the shadow of Cithaeron,—breathes a sigh of relief at the removal of the suspended "stone of Tantalus." Here too the Trojan war is introduced, as a mythical illustration, and the death of Achilles after his exploits on the Mysian plain; with the suggestion of comfort to the mourners that, as

[1] *Pyth.* I. 75 *sqq.*
*ἀρέομαι*
*παρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθηναίων χάριν μισθὸν κ.τ.λ.*

[2] *Pyth.* VII. 1.

[3] See note on *Nem.* IX. 28.

[4] *Isth.* IV. 5. See *Appendix* I.

the maidens of Helicon stood round the tomb of the son of Thetis, chanting a dirge over him, so they are now hastening from that Boeotian mountain, bearing this ode to the sepulchre of the dead.

If Aegina had not poets of her own, she had artists, original and distinguished, of another kind. If it fell to the lot of a Theban to weave her exploits into verse, it was an Aeginetan whom the Greeks called upon after the battle of Plataea to cast in bronze a colossal statue of Zeus for dedication at Olympia. Two other works were also executed from the tithe of the spoils, a colossal Poseidon for his temenos at Isthmus, and a snakewreathed tripod—still partly preserved —for Delphi; but it is not recorded to whom the making of these was entrusted. At this period the sculptors of Aegina were in high repute throughout all the Greek world, and received commissions for statues and other works of art from distant countries. The school of sculpture there begins with Smilis, who worked in the middle of the sixth century, being thus contemporary with Dipoenus and Scyllis the "Daedalids" of Crete, and bearing, like the legendary Daedalus, a name significant of his craft. The "Chiseller" had a fame beyond his own island. The Samians called upon him to carve in wood a new statue of Hera for their great temple; and for Olympia he wrought in gold and ivory images of the Horae—

τὰς χρυσάμπυκας ἀγλαοκάρπους ἀλαθέας Ὧρας,

as Pindar described them, perhaps with this very work of Smilis, which adorned the Heraeum there, present to his imagination. In the following period which witnessed the development and diffusion of the sculptor's art, after the initial difficulties had been overcome, Callon and then Onatas were the chief representatives of the "Aeginetan school"— ἐργασία Αἰγιναία—which, in contrast with the straining at Athens after greater freedom, remained to the last correct, precise, archaic. Of Callon—whose style, ancient writers say, was "harder" than that of Athenian Calamis of a younger generation—we know only two works by name; a wooden statue of Athena Sthenias, made for the acropolis of Troezen, and an image of the Kora for Amyclae.

Of a younger contemporary of Callon, Onatas son of Micon, we know more. His best work probably fell between the years 480 and 464—between those years in which the powers of Pindar were at their fullest, the greater number of the extant Odes of victory having been composed in that period. There is indeed no evidence pointing to a personal acquaintance between the poet and the sculptor, but it is a possibility which one likes to contemplate, and it is certainly anything

but improbable. There can be no doubt that Pindar often came "with the Graces" to Aegina, to direct the performance of his hymns[1], and was entertained there by his wealthy friends, of the Psalychiad, Theandrid and other houses. And he was interested, as words in his poems shew[2], like all intelligent Greeks of the day, in the development of the art, which was just then developing so rapidly and which was so congenial to the fashions of Greek life and to the Greek spirit. For the epinician poet the statuary's work must have had a special attraction, as both artists were engaged in the service of agonistic victors, fashioning for wrestler or racer an Olympian "palace" or a Νεμεαῖον ἄγαλμα, of music or metal or stone. If Pindar went himself to the Dorian island with his sea-song for Pytheas, he surely did not omit to visit the workshop of Glaucias and examine the works of the statue-maker, the images of athletes, perhaps the smooth-cheeked Pytheas himself passing into a marble form, destined, as the poet thought, "ever to stand on the selfsame base," perpetually idle. There he could study the contrast between the arts which, in the opening verses of that poem, he has indicated. The statue, once made, keeps continual holiday; the song is constantly sung. The marble or the bronze can be transported to a foreign place,—as many a carven work by native craftsmen was shipped in the port of Aegina to Sicily and other distant lands. But Glaucias could not say to the statue which he wrought for Gelon of Syracuse, as Pindar said to the song which he made for Pytheas; "go forth from Aegina in *every* merchant ship and in every boat,"—ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτῳ. The song can be, with ease, widely diffused, unlike the image[3].

Different as the two arts are, from the nature of their material, yet they had things in common—not least, the expression of rhythmic motion, —so that they could mutually influence each other. The study of that exact precision of line which marks the sculptor's art, teaching the poetic imagination a taste for singularly clear cut, unencumbered pictures—we can fancy that we perceive its traces in Pindar. One would like to imagine him in the workshop of Anaxagoras, watching that master modelling or casting the colossal image of Zeus, which was dedicated by the Greeks after the battle of Plataea. We may wonder whether the epithet ἀγλαός, which about that time he applied to Poseidon[4], was suggested by the bronze statue of the sea-god—the name of the caster

[1] Compare the remarks of A. Croiset, *La poésie de Pindare*, p. 96.

[2] Cp. Professor Jebb, *Pindar*, p. 179.

[3] So Professor Jebb, *ib.* p. 175.

[4] *Isth.* VII. 30.

is not recorded—in honour of the same victory. By some work of art that epithet, no less than ἀγλαοτρίαινα, was assuredly suggested[1].

But the name of Onatas has a special interest for us in reading the Isthmian Odes. The preservation of his fame, almost of his very name, he owes to the traveller Pausanias; but modern students of sculpture have shewn good reasons for believing that he was intimately connected with the design and execution of the greatest work of the Aeginetan School—the pediment sculptures of the Temple of Athena. Among the figures spared by time and now preserved at the Munich Glyptothek, may be some actually wrought by the hands of Onatas himself. The two pediments were parallel to each other in arrangement and alike in motive, representing each a battle-scene over the body of a fallen warrior in the presence of Athena[2]. The heroes of Aegina "twice sacked the city of the Trojans," δὶς πόλιν Τρώων πράθον,—this is in brief the argument of the pediments. The western, a little more "archaic," a little less finished than the other, and evidently the earlier work, deals with the second war, Achilles, the most famous Aeacid of that generation, taking the chief part on the Greek side in the fray over the corpse of a slain hero. The eastern represents, probably, the moment after the death of Oicles, the comrade of Heracles in his expedition against Troy; and here the Aeacid Telamon holds the front position, corresponding to Achilles. While this pediment points to a somewhat later stage in the development of technical skill, the sculptor of the western group was clearly the inventor, and it seems highly probable that he was no other than Onatas. Looking at those spare, correct figures chiselled with accurate skill, in their various attitudes, standing, kneeling or reclining, natural and yet all under a certain constraint—as though they were conscious themselves of their symmetrical grouping—, we may wonder what possibilities lay in the school of Aegina, what her sculpture would have come to, if the development of the island had not been arrested. Did any spiritual idea, waiting to come forth in its hour, lurk, like a dream, behind the unspeculative eyes or under the indifferent serenity of the mouths, not set into any character of smile or

[1] ἀγλαοτρίαινα, *Ol.* I. 41.—So too ὀρσοτρίαινα, which lexicographers and editors have misinterpreted as "trident shaking." If that were the meaning, the form would be ὀρσιτρίαινα, cp. ὀρσινεφής, ὀρσίκτυπος, λυσίπονος, &c. ὀρσοτρίαινα means ὀρσὰν τρίαιναν ἔχων (just as ἀγλαοτρίαινα means ἀγλαὰν τρίαιναν ἔχων) "with trident erect," and doubtless refers to representations in art. For ὀρσός = ὀρθός compare ὀρσόθριξ, ὀρσολοπεῖν.

[2] For Aeginetan sculpture I have made use of Overbeck's *Gesch. der griechischen Plastik* and Mr Murray's *History of Greek Sculpture.*

purpose, not betraying the pain of the wounded or the stern intention of the fighter,—Charis, at this stage of the art, finding it necessary, one might say, to veil all faces with a comely mask which told only of comeliness? But Aegina was not the place of her full revelation.

It is generally allowed that these sculptures were begun after the Persian war and were a sort of Aeginetan monument commemorating the deliverance of Hellas from her ἀτόλματος μόχθος. And thus it becomes very interesting to regard them in connexion with the second ode written by Pindar for Phylacidas, where, as we have seen, the Trojan expeditions are likewise brought into connexion with the Persian war. We may suppose that Onatas was beginning to design his pediments about the same time that Pindar was writing this hymn, and the thought might occur that the poet had given the idea to the sculptor. But the idea of a comparison between the Trojan and the Persian episodes as being, both, trials of strength between Greek and barbarian—the idea worked out historically by Herodotus—was probably "in the air" at the time. In any case Pindar's verses are a good commentary on the two groups of—was it Onatas and his son Calliteles?—:

> ἀλλ' ἐν Οἰνώνᾳ μεγαλήτορες ὀργαὶ
> Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε· τοὶ καὶ συμμάχοις
> δὶς πόλιν Τρώων πράθον, ἑσπόμενοι
> Ἡρακλῆι πρότερον,
> καὶ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις.

But in another Aeginetan ode there is a passage which, I venture to suggest, may have been directly inspired by the western pediment of the temple of Athena. Achilles was the chief Aeacid hero in the second war as Telamon in the first, and there can be no doubt that on the pediment he occupied the front position on the Greek side. The scene was assuredly not the battle over his corpse, as Welcker and others have held. Nor is the other theory of a battle over the body of Patroclus satisfactory. It seems to me not insignificant that in the Aeginetan poems of Pindar the event which stands out as the most brilliant exploit of Achilles is the slaying of Memnon the son of the Morning. The battle of Achilles and Memnon was a frequent subject of art, and on old vases it is represented as fought over the body of Antilochus, whom Memnon had slain. The Ἀχιλλέως μονομαχία πρὸς Μέμνονα was wrought in relief on the throne of Amyclae[1] and on the chest of Cypselus[2]. May not Onatas have chosen this episode for the

[1] Paus. III. 18. 7.

[2] Paus. V. 19. 1. Here the mothers of the heroes, Thetis and Eos, stood beside them, and this became a constant feature in paintings of the scene.

subject of his sculptures? may not the dead warrior be Antilochus, and the two heroes, who fight over him, Achilles and Memnon? If this be so, Pindar may have had before his imagination the very figures, which we can see at Munich, when he wrote

> *βαρὺ δέ σφιν*
> *νεῖκος Ἀχιλεὺς <φᾶνε> χαμᾶζε καβὰς ἀφ' ἁρμάτων*
> *φαεννᾶς υἱὸν εὖτ' ἐνάριξεν Ἀόος ἀκᾷ*
> *ἔγχεος ζακότοιο*[1].

The words "having descended from his chariot on the ground" sound as if he were describing a visible representation of the scene.

About twenty years after the repulse of the Persians, a war broke out between Athens and Sparta,—an anticipation on a small scale of the greater war between the Athenians and the Lacedaemonians, which is generally, though not by Thucydides, called "the Peloponnesian War." The chief powers of Greece took sides, Corinth joining Sparta, while Phocis, Thessaly and Megara, perhaps more by constraint than of free will, supported Athens. Aegina did not hesitate to help the Peloponnesians at sea with her powerful fleet, and the mother city Epidaurus was ranged on the same side. The chronology of this war is full of perplexity; but this is not the place to consider how events are to be disposed in the archonships of Philocles and Bion, what is meant by the "year" in the Inscription of the Erechtheid Phyle[2], how the evidence of the *Constitution of the Athenians* is to be reconciled with Thucydides. It seems likely that the hostilities began in the middle of 459 B.C. At Halieis the Athenians were defeated by the

[1] *Nem.* VI. 50. Cp. *Nem.* III. 72.

[2] *C. I. A.* I. 433 Ἐρεχθηΐδος οἵδε ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ ἀπέθανον ἐν Κύπρῳ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἐν Φοινίκῃ ἐν Ἁλιεῦσιν ἐν Αἰγίνῃ Μεγαροῖ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ. The question is whether the year is a civil or a natural year. If the chronology of Diodorus could be trusted—unluckily it cannot—, the civil year would be excluded, as he places the events mentioned in two different archonships. But when the German investigators profess to tell us what Diodorus took from Ephorus, and what from some chronographer — Apollodorus or Castor—, one hardly feels safe in following them. It seems clear, I think, that the siege of Aegina began about May 458 and ended in the following spring, and thus the Battle of Aegina must fall in 458. One of the most recent German works on the "Fifty years" is a dissertation of J. Mosler, *Chronologie der Pentekontaëtie* (1890), and his conclusions on this special point, although far from lucidly expressed, are perhaps near the truth. Both he and Christ (*op. cit.*) agree as to the beginning of the siege of Aegina; but while Christ would place Tanagra in Oct. or Nov., Mosler would have it in August, consequently Oenophyta in October.—I doubt the statement in the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία that Themistocles was at Athens in the archonship of Conon (462—461 B.C.).

purpose, not betraying the pain of the wounded or the stern intention of the fighter,—Charis, at this stage of the art, finding it necessary, one might say, to veil all faces with a comely mask which told only of comeliness? But Aegina was not the place of her full revelation.

It is generally allowed that these sculptures were begun after the Persian war and were a sort of Aeginetan monument commemorating the deliverance of Hellas from her ἀτόλματος μόχθος. And thus it becomes very interesting to regard them in connexion with the second ode written by Pindar for Phylacidas, where, as we have seen, the Trojan expeditions are likewise brought into connexion with the Persian war. We may suppose that Onatas was beginning to design his pediments about the same time that Pindar was writing this hymn, and the thought might occur that the poet had given the idea to the sculptor. But the idea of a comparison between the Trojan and the Persian episodes as being, both, trials of strength between Greek and barbarian—the idea worked out historically by Herodotus—was probably "in the air" at the time. In any case Pindar's verses are a good commentary on the two groups of—was it Onatas and his son Calliteles?—:

> ἀλλ' ἐν Οἰνώνᾳ μεγαλήτορες ὀργαὶ
> Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε· τοὶ καὶ συμμάχοις
> δὶς πόλιν Τρώων πράθον, ἑσπόμενοι
> Ἡρακλῆι πρότερον,
> καὶ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις.

But in another Aeginetan ode there is a passage which, I venture to suggest, may have been directly inspired by the western pediment of the temple of Athena. Achilles was the chief Aeacid hero in the second war as Telamon in the first, and there can be no doubt that on the pediment he occupied the front position on the Greek side. The scene was assuredly not the battle over his corpse, as Welcker and others have held. Nor is the other theory of a battle over the body of Patroclus satisfactory. It seems to me not insignificant that in the Aeginetan poems of Pindar the event which stands out as the most brilliant exploit of Achilles is the slaying of Memnon the son of the Morning. The battle of Achilles and Memnon was a frequent subject of art, and on old vases it is represented as fought over the body of Antilochus, whom Memnon had slain. The Ἀχιλλέως μονομαχία πρὸς Μέμνονα was wrought in relief on the throne of Amyclae[1] and on the chest of Cypselus[2]. May not Onatas have chosen this episode for the

[1] Paus. III. 18. 7.

[2] Paus. V. 19. 1. Here the mothers of the heroes, Thetis and Eos, stood beside them, and this became a constant feature in paintings of the scene.

subject of his sculptures? may not the dead warrior be Antilochus, and the two heroes, who fight over him, Achilles and Memnon? If this be so, Pindar may have had before his imagination the very figures, which we can see at Munich, when he wrote

> βαρὺ δέ σφιν
> νεῖκος Ἀχιλεὺς <φᾶνε> χαμᾶζε καβὰς ἀφ' ἁρμάτων
> φαεννᾶς υἱὸν εὖτ' ἐνάριξεν Ἀόος ἀκᾷ
> ἔγχεος ζακότοιο[1].

The words "having descended from his chariot on the ground" sound as if he were describing a visible representation of the scene.

About twenty years after the repulse of the Persians, a war broke out between Athens and Sparta,—an anticipation on a small scale of the greater war between the Athenians and the Lacedaemonians, which is generally, though not by Thucydides, called "the Peloponnesian War." The chief powers of Greece took sides, Corinth joining Sparta, while Phocis, Thessaly and Megara, perhaps more by constraint than of free will, supported Athens. Aegina did not hesitate to help the Peloponnesians at sea with her powerful fleet, and the mother city Epidaurus was ranged on the same side. The chronology of this war is full of perplexity; but this is not the place to consider how events are to be disposed in the archonships of Philocles and Bion, what is meant by the "year" in the Inscription of the Erechtheid Phyle[2], how the evidence of the *Constitution of the Athenians* is to be reconciled with Thucydides. It seems likely that the hostilities began in the middle of 459 B.C. At Halieis the Athenians were defeated by the

[1] *Nem.* VI. 50. Cp. *Nem.* III. 72.

[2] *C. I. A.* I. 433 Ἐρεχθηΐδος οἵδε ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ ἀπέθανον ἐν Κύπρῳ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἐν Φοινίκῃ ἐν Ἁλιεῦσιν ἐν Αἰγίνῃ Μεγαροῖ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ. The question is whether the year is a civil or a natural year. If the chronology of Diodorus could be trusted—unluckily it cannot—, the civil year would be excluded, as he places the events mentioned in two different archonships. But when the German investigators profess to tell us what Diodorus took from Ephorus, and what from some chronographer — Apollodorus or Castor—, one hardly feels safe in following them. It seems clear, I think, that the siege of Aegina began about May 458 and ended in the following spring, and thus the Battle of Aegina must fall in 458. One of the most recent German works on the "Fifty years" is a dissertation of J. Mosler, *Chronologie der Pentekontaëtie* (1890), and his conclusions on this special point, although far from lucidly expressed, are perhaps near the truth. Both he and Christ (*op. cit.*) agree as to the beginning of the siege of Aegina; but while Christ would place Tanagra in Oct. or Nov., Mosler would have it in August, consequently Oenophyta in October.—I doubt the statement in the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία that Themistocles was at Athens in the archonship of Conon (462—461 B.C.).

ordinary cases, actually proposes to read Ἀφαρηϊάδαι for Ἀφαρητίδαι in *Nem.* x. 65 where we expect a spondee.

Another canon is that a spondee cannot take the place of a dactyl. But against this we have *Ol.* XIV. 21, Φερσεφόνᾱς ἔλθ' Ἀχοῖ, where it has been proposed to read ἴθι or ἔλυθ'. Moreover in *Isth.* VII. 34, the MSS give θεσφάτων ἤκουσαν, where the other strophes have –⏑–⏑⏑–⏑. As the sense leaves nothing to be desired, it seems to me very arbitrary to accept, as most editors do, ἐπάκουσαν from the Triclinian MSS ε, ζ. (Cookesley follows Kayser in reading θέσφατ' ἄϊον· ἔννεπεν γάρ.) In any case, though it is a rule generally observed, there can be little doubt that it might be relaxed in the case of proper names. In *Ol.* v. 18 (an ode whose Pindaric authorship has been questioned) we find

εὐρὺ ῥέοντ' Ἰδαῖόν τε σεμνὸν ἄντρον

where the corresponding verses have a dactyl[1]. I am therefore impenitent as to the correction of *Nem.* x. 5 (πολλὰ δ' Αἰγύπτῳ Ἰὼ κτίσεν) which I put forward in my *Nemean Odes*.

The resolution of the trochaic thesis is, as we have seen, confessed to be admissible. It seems not unlikely that it occurs in *Isth.* VI. 22 where the MSS have

ἄγει τ' ἀρετὰν οὐκ αἴσχιον φυᾶς.

I have adopted in the text αἰσχίω (the reading of Triclinian MSS): cp. *Isth.* I. 63, εὐθυμίαν μείζω φέρει. But I am not at all sure that αἰσχίονα (so Bothe) implying a tribrach for a trochee is not the true reading.

[1] Boehmer, *op. cit.* IX.: "O. 5. 24 kommt ῥέοντ' Ἰδαῖον, wenn es richtig, auf Rechnung der Eigennamen."

# ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΙ ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙΣ.

## ISTHMIAN I.

### ODE IN HONOUR OF A VICTORY IN THE CHARIOT RACE AT ISTHMUS WON BY HERODOTUS OF THEBES.

### INTRODUCTION.

WHEN Pindar was summoned to celebrate an Isthmian victory won by his countryman Herodotus, he was engaged on the composition of a paean to the Delian Apollo; but a sense of filial duty, as he says, prompted him to set aside the unfinished paean, for the sake of his 'mother Theba' to whose honour the success of Herodotus redounded. But for this preference he apologises in such a graceful way that Apollo could not possibly feel an offence. In fact he skilfully turns the matter so as to make it appear that Apollo is actually a gainer by the postponement of his own special song. Men of Ceos had entrusted to Pindar the task of composing the paean, and it was to be sung in their island. But now, owing to this delay, not so inopportune after all, the praises of Apollo will resound not only in Ceos, but also on the Isthmus; this accident affording an opportunity for introducing him into a work where Poseidon naturally claims the chief place. Apollo indeed was by no means out of place there, for, like Hermes, he was a god interested in contests (ἀγώνιος), and a guardian of strong young men[1].

After an address to Theba 'of the golden shield', and the graceful apology to Delos and Apollo for postponing the paean—which suggests a picture of

[1] See Roscher *Lexikon der gr. und röm. Mythologie*, pp. 442, 443, article *Apollon* ("als Ideal der männlichen Jugend"). Cp. the scholium quoted in note on l. 11 of this ode.

'seaside men' dancing on the shores of Ceos—Pindar declares triumphantly that six crowns had been won for Thebes[1], the city

*in which Alcmena bare her undaunted son who once on a time sent a shudder through the dogs of Geryones.*

As Heracles was the most famous hero of Thebes, it is always appropriate to speak of it as the city of Heracles; but here the question forces itself upon one—why is the adventure with Geryones in the far west chosen as a characteristic labour of the great deliverer? We shall, in due course, discover an answer to this question in a later part of the ode.

But it is not Heracles, but Herodotus, that Pindar has come to praise: Herodotus, who drove his own four-horsed chariot, depending on no charioteer as is stated with a certain emphasis. Clearly the car[2] of song, in which such prowess deserved to be borne, was no less than a nome in honour of Castor himself, a Καστόρειον as the technical name went. Yet it was not to the deeds of a Spartan hero that a Theban poet would most gladly liken the deeds of a Theban victor. Thebes had her own mythical charioteer, Iolaus the companion and nephew of Heracles; none could be a more fitting prototype for the Theban Herodotus than he. But Iolaus never gave, like Castor, his name to a particular class of 'equestrian nome'; and thus, for the sake of form[3], Pindar links Castor and Iolaus together; a partnership in which the Spartan hero plays a formal, the Theban the real part. Yet when one reads, 'for of heroes they were the best charioteers born at Lacedaemon and at Thebes', one can hardly help thinking that if, when these words were written, there were some special bond between the city of Dirce and the city of the Eurotas, the collocation Λακεδαίμονι καὶ Θήβαις would have been impressive indeed[4].

That Iolaus, and not Castor, is the true parallel to Herodotus throughout a description in which the plural number is formally used, Pindar takes care to shew by verbal signals. We are told how they carried off prizes, tripods and cauldrons and plates of gold, and made their houses fair with such monuments of valour, won in all sorts of contests, not only chariot-races but foot-races both for unclad and for heavy-armed runners, trials in javelin-throwing and in quoit-throwing. But it is in the prizes of Iolaus rather than of Castor that the poet is interested, and to the curious who

[1] Mezger thinks that the *Grundgedanke* of the hymn is *abundance of crowns* won for Thebes, as in mythical times by Iolaus, so recently by Herodotus. But he does not express this very lucidly (p. 312), and he introduces 'the Tyndarids', whereas only one Tyndarid is mentioned and his part is subordinate (only 'formell' as Mezger himself rightly pointed out). He divides the ode thus: ἀρχά, 1—13, κατατροπά, 14—16, ὀμφαλός, 17—31, μετακατατροπά, 32—33, σφραγίς, 34—63, ἐξόδιον, 64—68.

[2] ἐναρμόξαι l. 16, see note.

[3] Mezger, p. 308: 'Die Erwähnung Kastors ist also auf formelle Rücksichten zurückzuführen'.

[4] This struck Dissen who therefore assigned the ode to 457 B.C. shortly before the battle of Tanagra. He also called attention to πολεμίζων l. 50, finding in it (needlessly) a reference to a war threatening Thebes. Mezger has pointed out the weakness of Dissen's arguments.

examine his signals he displays his intention thus. (*a*) In the 4th line of strophe 2 we have

σευόμενοι στεφάνων

responding punctually to the 4th line of antistrophos I

δειράδ'· ἐπεὶ στεφάνους.

This responsion suggests that the crowns in the second case, as in the first case, were won for Thebes, that is, by Iolaus. (*b*) φιάλαισί τε χρυσοῦ, l. 20, and (*c*) ἀσπιδοδούποισιν, l. 23, have the same intent, reminding us of χρύσασπι Θήβα, l. 1. And (*d*) χερσίν, l. 24, which by itself would prove nothing, may be connected with this group of signals; compare χερσί, l. 15, where it implies the hands of Herodotus himself. (*e*) τέλος l. 27: τέλος l. 6.

Before we leave these heroes, in order to pass again to modern things, we have a picture of them shining, Castor on the banks of the Eurotas, Iolaus by the waters of Dirce, each crowned with leaves of victory, standing, as it were, in his place to receive the 'Farewell' of the singers.

The third part of the hymn, like the second, is ushered in by the poet himself; an emphatic 'I':

l. 14 ἀλλ' ἐγὼ Ἡροδότῳ
l. 32 ἐγὼ δὲ ———— τοῦδ' ἀνδρός.

In both cases Pindar's suggestion seems to be that he has, chiefly at least, to do with modern events, not with ancient tales, which had their own poets. He affects to recall himself to his proper province. 'Heracles slew Geryones: but I am the poet of a modern Theban.' 'Farewell, O Castor and Iolaus; for I am the poet of Herodotus.' A second time, however, he passes away from the present, but not to such a distant age as that of Iolaus. He passes away to a person and an event which interested and affected Herodotus very nearly.

By the favour of Poseidon, Herodotus had won the greatest and latest of all his victories, that at the Isthmian games. But not always had Poseidon shewn such favour to the house of the victor. Asopodorus, his father, had little reason to bless the god of the ocean. It would seem that he was a trader, and that his ships venturing beyond the western straits into the 'immeasurable' Atlantic sea were wrecked there, the loss of his worldly goods well-nigh proving his ruin. One might think from Pindar's words that Asopodorus himself suffered shipwreck and barely escaped with his life. However that may have been, the sea had not been his friend. And it was a happy thought of Pindar to work into his hymn the idea that the god of the sea had compensated to the son the injury which he had done the father. In an ode honouring Poseidon it would have been unseemly openly to express this thought,—a reflexion on the god. But it was easy for Pindar, with a system of signals at his command, to suggest it. The 3rd verse of the 3rd strophe referring to the shipwreck, is

37 ἐξ ἀμετρήτας ἁλὸς ἐν κρυοέσσᾳ,

'seaside men' dancing on the shores of Ceos—Pindar declares triumphantly that six crowns had been won for Thebes[1], the city

*in which Alcmena bare her undaunted son who once on a time sent a shudder through the dogs of Geryones.*

As Heracles was the most famous hero of Thebes, it is always appropriate to speak of it as the city of Heracles; but here the question forces itself upon one—why is the adventure with Geryones in the far west chosen as a characteristic labour of the great deliverer? We shall, in due course, discover an answer to this question in a later part of the ode.

But it is not Heracles, but Herodotus, that Pindar has come to praise: Herodotus, who drove his own four-horsed chariot, depending on no charioteer as is stated with a certain emphasis. Clearly the car[2] of song, in which such prowess deserved to be borne, was no less than a nome in honour of Castor himself, a Καστόρειον as the technical name went. Yet it was not to the deeds of a Spartan hero that a Theban poet would most gladly liken the deeds of a Theban victor. Thebes had her own mythical charioteer, Iolaus the companion and nephew of Heracles; none could be a more fitting prototype for the Theban Herodotus than he. But Iolaus never gave, like Castor, his name to a particular class of 'equestrian nome'; and thus, for the sake of form[3], Pindar links Castor and Iolaus together; a partnership in which the Spartan hero plays a formal, the Theban the real part. Yet when one reads, 'for of heroes they were the best charioteers born at Lacedaemon and at Thebes', one can hardly help thinking that if, when these words were written, there were some special bond between the city of Dirce and the city of the Eurotas, the collocation Λακεδαίμονι καὶ Θήβαις would have been impressive indeed[4].

That Iolaus, and not Castor, is the true parallel to Herodotus throughout a description in which the plural number is formally used, Pindar takes care to shew by verbal signals. We are told how they carried off prizes, tripods and cauldrons and plates of gold, and made their houses fair with such monuments of valour, won in all sorts of contests, not only chariot-races but foot-races both for unclad and for heavy-armed runners, trials in javelin-throwing and in quoit-throwing. But it is in the prizes of Iolaus rather than of Castor that the poet is interested, and to the curious who

[1] Mezger thinks that the *Grundgedanke* of the hymn is *abundance of crowns* won for Thebes, as in mythical times by Iolaus, so recently by Herodotus. But he does not express this very lucidly (p. 312), and he introduces 'the Tyndarids', whereas only one Tyndarid is mentioned and his part is subordinate (only 'formell' as Mezger himself rightly pointed out). He divides the ode thus: ἀρχά, 1—13, καταтροπά, 14—16, ὀμφαλός, 17—31, μετακαταтροπά, 32—33, σφραγίς, 34—63, ἐξόδιον, 64—68.

[2] ἐναρμόξαι l. 16, see note.

[3] Mezger, p. 308: 'Die Erwähnung Kastors ist also auf formelle Rücksichten zurückzuführen'.

[4] This struck Dissen who therefore assigned the ode to 457 B.C. shortly before the battle of Tanagra. He also called attention to πολεμίζων l. 50, finding in it (needlessly) a reference to a war threatening Thebes. Mezger has pointed out the weakness of Dissen's arguments.

examine his signals he displays his intention thus. (*a*) In the 4th line of strophe 2 we have

σευόμενοι στεφάνων

responding punctually to the 4th line of antistrophos I

δειράδ᾽· ἐπεὶ στεφάνους.

This responsion suggests that the crowns in the second case, as in the first case, were won for Thebes, that is, by Iolaus. (*b*) φιάλαισί τε χρυσοῦ, l. 20, and (*c*) ἀσπιδοδούποισιν, l. 23, have the same intent, reminding us of χρύσασπι Θήβα, l. 1. And (*d*) χερσίν, l. 24, which by itself would prove nothing, may be connected with this group of signals; compare χερσί, l. 15, where it implies the hands of Herodotus himself. (*e*) τέλος l. 27: τέλος l. 6.

Before we leave these heroes, in order to pass again to modern things, we have a picture of them shining, Castor on the banks of the Eurotas, Iolaus by the waters of Dirce, each crowned with leaves of victory, standing, as it were, in his place to receive the 'Farewell' of the singers.

The third part of the hymn, like the second, is ushered in by the poet himself; an emphatic 'I':

l. 14 ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ Ἡροδότῳ
l. 32 ἐγὼ δὲ ———— τοῦδ᾽ ἀνδρός.

In both cases Pindar's suggestion seems to be that he has, chiefly at least, to do with modern events, not with ancient tales, which had their own poets. He affects to recall himself to his proper province. 'Heracles slew Geryones: but I am the poet of a modern Theban.' 'Farewell, O Castor and Iolaus; for I am the poet of Herodotus.' A second time, however, he passes away from the present, but not to such a distant age as that of Iolaus. He passes away to a person and an event which interested and affected Herodotus very nearly.

By the favour of Poseidon, Herodotus had won the greatest and latest of all his victories, that at the Isthmian games. But not always had Poseidon shewn such favour to the house of the victor. Asopodorus, his father, had little reason to bless the god of the ocean. It would seem that he was a trader, and that his ships venturing beyond the western straits into the 'immeasurable' Atlantic sea were wrecked there, the loss of his worldly goods well-nigh proving his ruin. One might think from Pindar's words that Asopodorus himself suffered shipwreck and barely escaped with his life. However that may have been, the sea had not been his friend. And it was a happy thought of Pindar to work into his hymn the idea that the god of the sea had compensated to the son the injury which he had done the father. In an ode honouring Poseidon it would have been unseemly openly to express this thought,—a reflexion on the god. But it was easy for Pindar, with a system of signals at his command, to suggest it. The 3rd verse of the 3rd strophe referring to the shipwreck, is

37 ἐξ ἀμετρήτας ἁλὸς ἐν κρυοέσσᾳ,

accurately responding[1] to the 3rd verse of the 1st antistrophos, which refers to the celebration of the victory on the Isthmus:

9 ἀνδράσιν, κὰν τὰν ἁλι-Fερκέα Ἰσθμοῦ.

The *sea* which wrecked the ships of Asopodorus is the *sea* which was associated with the triumph of Herodotus.

Asopodorus survived the shipwreck. He withdrew to Orchomenus his own city[2], and there won back prosperity. The language of Pindar shews that he was a man of indomitable energy, who had performed great labours. This is a point on which the poet manifestly wished to lay stress; for the words 'labour' and 'toil' are repeated in almost consecutive lines:

40 ὁ πονήσαις: 42 πόνοις:
46 μόχθων παντοδαπῶν.

And here we approach the explanation of that difficulty which came up in the early part of the ode, the—intrusion, as it almost seemed, of Geryones.

Let us bear in mind that Herodotus was compared to Iolaus, of whom Pindar (l. 30) speaks as 'the son of Iphicles'.

Ἰφικλέος μὲν παῖς

(in the 1st line of the 2nd epode) may signal to

παῖδα

(in the 1st line of the 1st epode); if so, Iphicles signals to his brother Heracles; the point being to remind us that Heracles was the uncle of Iolaus. Iolaus is the prototype of Herodotus; the insinuation seems to be that Heracles is the prototype of Asopodorus. And so he proves to be[3]. Not only is Asopodorus, like Heracles, a man of labours; but the most remarkable event in his life finds a special parallel in the life of Heracles. The shipwreck of Asopodorus in the far west is compared to an adventure of Heracles on those distant shores. We can now answer the question which we asked above. We can see why the battle with Geryones was chosen for special mention out of all the deeds of the son of Alcmena, see, too, why the son of Alcmena is mentioned at all. The point of resemblance between the father of Herodotus and the uncle of Iolaus is that both laboured, and in the same perilous places, where stretches the 'immeasurable sea'.

Asopodorus is praised for his generosity in expending money on noble

[1] This important responsion was not noticed by Mezger.

[2] Herodotus was Θηβαῖος, but it does not appear whether he was born so, or not. One may imagine that Asopodorus of Orchomenus had become a Theban citizen, retaining however property in the territory of Orchomenus, to which he retired in the day of his adversity.

[3] Further indications of this train of thought may lie in ἀγακλέα τὰν Ἀσωποδώρου πατρὸς αἶσαν, which may suggest the second part of the names Ἰφικλέα (mentioned a few lines before) and Ἡρακλέα; and in συγγενὴς πότμος which may echo the description of Iolaus as ὁμόδαμος ἐὼν Σπαρτῶν γένει.

objects of ambition, as well as for his manifold labours; for which praise in song, assuredly due, is paid in this hymn, which is a gift to Asopodorus as well as to Herodotus. And in connexion with the enthusiasm of the father and the son for the Hellenic games, Pindar meditates on the conditions of humanity. Different men have different occupations; and different occupations produce different pleasures as their results. But in the first instance, the end of all men is alike: merely to keep off 'brute hunger'[1] from their bellies. When this first need is supplied, they advance from necessaries to luxuries; and of all luxuries glory is regarded as the highest, the most refined. 'Whosoever wins, in games or in war, the luxury of glory, he receives the highest prize, even the praises of fellow-citizens and of foreigners[2].' *The luxury of glory*,—that is the meaning of κῦδος ἁβρόν.

It is to be observed that the poet speaks here of winning fame 'in war' (πολεμίζων) as well as in games. An unwarranted inference has been drawn by some, that some particular contemporary war, affecting Thebes, must be meant. But the introduction of war here is perfectly accounted for if we remember that these lines are meant for Asopodorus as well as for Herodotus, glory won 'in war' applying to the father; as glory won in games applies to the son. Not that Asopodorus fought battles. But Heracles, who did fight battles, is here the prototype of Asopodorus; just as Iolaus is the prototype of Herodotus; 'war' being readily understood as typical of the harder labours of life.

And now we have another transition, this time to the immediate cause of the hymn, Herodotus and his victories. Once more the transition is made with an emphatic first person:

52 ἄμμι δ' ἔοικε.

Once more Poseidon is praised for the recent victory at Isthmus, and five other victories at other places are enumerated. Herodotus had been successful at the games in his own towns; at the Theban festival in honour of Heracles or Iolaus, and at the Orchomenian festival in honour of Minyas. He had also come home crowned with barley from the games of Demeter at Eleusis; he had been victorious in Euboea, and he had been victorious too in remoter Phylace, on the gulf of Pagasae, where a contest was held in honour of Protesilaus. On these occasions the noble quality of the fortunate Theban was brilliantly proved; even as the valour of Iolaus was proved in the races which he ran whether simply or in armour. This comparison is brought out by a responsion. At the end of strophe 2 we read

λάμπει δὲ σαφὴς ἀρετὰ
ἔν τε γυμνοῖσι σταδίοις σφίσιν ἔν τ' ἀσπιδοδούποισιν ὁπλίταις δρόμοις

[1] λιμὸν αἰανῆ.

[2] The mention of foreigners as well as citizens may have been suggested by the mythical instances of the present hymn. Pindar praising Theban Iolaus is a πολιάτας; praising Laconian Castor, he is a ξένος.

of Castor and Iolaus; and at the end of strophe 4

καὶ τὸ Δάματρος κλυτὸν ἄλσος Ἐλευσῖνα καὶ Εὔβοιαν ἐν γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις

of Herodotus.

Other victories too, of less account, had fallen to the lot of Herodotus, by the favour of Hermes, 'lord of games'; but Pindar declines to recount them, alleging the 'short measure' of his hymn. And, he adds, 'that which is hidden in silence often brings a greater dole of joy'. Here we become aware of another and a stranger group of signals. The last word of the fourth antistrophos corresponds to the last word of the third strophe[1]:

40 συγγενὴς εὐαμερίας. ὁ πονήσαις δὲ νόῳ καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει.
63 ὕμνος. ἦ μὰν πολλάκι καὶ τὸ σεσωπαμένον εὐθυμίαν μείζω φέρει.

In the first passage it is implied that the renewed prosperity of Asopodorus was partly due to the 'forethought' which he had learned in adversity. Herodotus has not learned in that school himself; his labours have been crowned with success; but still higher successes may be in store for him —an Olympian or Pythian victory, for instance,—if he is moderate in his prosperity, appreciating the value of silence and reserve. In this way Pindar delicately hints at the principle of the Measure, which should determine life, as it actually determines art,—excluding, for example, from this hymn matters of which Herodotus might have wished to hear at large:

62 ἀφαιρεῖται βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχων ὕμνος.

And was not the import of the Measure indicated, figuratively, in the very calamity which happened to his father? For it was in the sea beyond the Atlantic limits, the sea *which knows no measure*, that the shipwreck took place.

37 ἐξ ἀμετρήτας ἁλὸς ἐν κρυοέσσᾳ συντυχίᾳ.

And if Asopodorus recovered after that blow, it was due to his prudence and moderation, a temper of which his name even might seem to contain an augury, as Pindar suggests in the words

34 τὰν Ἀ-σωπο-δώρου πατρὸς αἶσαν,

which he explains by a signal in l. 63—

τὸ σεσωπαμένον.

*Silence*, symbolic of a becoming reserve, is the omen of Asopodorus; it may not be ill, Pindar seems to hint, if the son too adopt it as a maxim.

He hints at this before he goes on to pray that Herodotus may yet charge his hands with leaves of Pythian or Olympian wreaths, and appear crowned on the banks of Dirce, even as Iolaus of old appeared:

29 ἔρνεσιν. 66 ἔρνεσι.

The winning of such wreaths means considerable expense; but Herodotus s not a hoarder. He is not one of those who keep their wealth at home, and go down to the grave without glory. The way in which Pindar puts

[1] This responsion was not observed by Mezger.

this seems to imply that some of his fellow-citizens had criticized Herodotus for extravagance.

The latter part of the fourth system contains a group of echoes answering to the latter part of the first system. A comparison seems to be instituted between the success of the victor which has led to the present hymn, and the possible successes which may cause a future hymn. (*a*) *τιμὰν τεύχοντ'* l. 67 echoes *τεύχω γέρας* l. 14[1]. (*β*) The *hand* which guided the reins of the victorious chariot at Isthmus may yet feel the touch of an olive crown at Olympia or a laurel wreath at Pytho; this is suggested by a metrically accurate responsion[2].

15 *ἀνία τ' ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντ' ἐθέλω.*
66 *'Αλφεοῦ ἔρνεσι φράξαι χεῖρα τιμὰν ἑπταπύλοις.*

But there is another pair of echoes which seem to have some darker meaning. (*γ*) In l. 67 we have *εἰ δέ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον, ἄλλοισι δ' ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ*, which seem to signal to *ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντ'*[3]. This may mean that the independence of Herodotus in driving his own chariot is of a piece with his indifference to the opinion of others in regard to the dispensing of his own wealth. But it crosses one's mind that some hint may have been here intended for Herodotus himself. Can Pindar have wished to insinuate that it might be well for him not to drive his own chariot but to employ a charioteer? Can he have meant to say, 'let those hands, which held the reins, henceforward handle only wreaths'? Was this a point in which Herodotus was asked to take a lesson from the 'prudence' (*προμάθεια*) of his father? If so, the last words of the hymn would have a double edge; the second, darker signification being that Herodotus might do well if he were to go a little further in his outlay and pay the hands of others to guide the reins of his chariot in those dangerous contests. One might even wonder whether some accident had somewhere befallen the son of Asopodorus,—concealed and suggested by the poet in his *τὸ σεσωπαμένον*.

[1] Not noticed by Mezger.

[2] Jealousy is hinted at in l. 44 *φθονεραῖσι γνώμαις*.

[3] *νέμω* is also significant in the Second Isthmian (see ll. 22 and 47).

## METRICAL ANALYSIS.

(*Rhythm: dactyloepitritic.*)

### Strophe.

– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ – ⏒<br>
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏓ .<br>
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏒<br>
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓<br>
*v.* 5. ⏑ | – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ .<br>
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – . – ⏑ ⏑ – . – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏓ .

M. Schmidt arranges this scheme in three parts, the first and third corresponding in the number of feet. A (*vv.* 1 and 2) = A′ (*v.* 6); B = *vv.* 3, 4, 5. In order to give A eleven feet (like A′), he interprets the third foot of the strophe as two; thus:

*μᾶτερ ἐμ-* | *ἁ τὸ τε-* | *ὸν·* | *χρύσ-·* | *ασπι* | *Θήβα.*

### Epode.

– | – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏓ .<br>
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏓ .<br>
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ –<br>
– | – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – . – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – ⏒<br>
*v.* 5. – . | – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – ⏑

Here Schmidt's scheme is epodic: A (*vv.* 1, 2), A′ (*vv.* 3, 4), B (*v.* 5), and the number of feet is

$$A, A' = (8+8) = 16.$$
$$B = 13.$$

In order to obtain this, he interprets the syllables *-να φρίξ-* in l. 13 (similarly in the first verse of the other epodes) as each a trisêmos (–.); and treats *-αις οὐ* (l. 15, etc.) in the same way. In *v.* 5 he assumes a pause equivalent to a foot at the beginning.

# ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙ Α'.

## ΗΡΟΔΟΤΩι ΘΗΒΑΙΩι

### ΑΡΜΑΤΙ.

Μᾶτερ ἐμά, τὸ τεόν, χρύσασπι Θήβα, *στρ. α'.*
πρᾶγμα καὶ ἀσχολίας ὑπέρτερον
θήσομαι. μή μοι κραναὰ νεμεσάσαι
Δᾶλος, ἐν ᾇ κέχυμαι.

1. **Μᾶτερ** κ.τ.λ.] *Thy concern, O my mother, Theba of the golden shield, will I set above business itself.* There was doubtless at Thebes a statue of Theba bearing a golden shield. That she was arrayed too in a robe of gold may be inferred from *frag.* 195, εὐάρματε χρυσοχίτων ἱερώτατον ἄγαλμα. Her statue at Olympia, a gift from Phlius, is mentioned by Pausanias (v. 22, 5). **χρύσασπις** is applied to Ares in *Isth.* vi. 25; Euripides (*Phoenissae*, 1372) has it of Pallas.—Both the *gold* and the *shield* are meaning here, signalling to the second strophe (ll. 20, 23); see *Introduction*, p. 3.

2. **καὶ ἀσχολίας**] 'Even preoccupation' in plain prose. This phrase of Pindar became 'a familiar quotation.' We have it in Plato *Phaedrus*, 227 B οὐκ ἂν οἴει με κατὰ Πίνδαρον καὶ ἀσχολίας ὑπέρτερον πρᾶγμα ποιήσεσθαι τὸ σήν τε καὶ Λυσίου διατριβὴν ἀκοῦσαι. ἄσχολος occurs in *Pyth.* viii. 29 and σχολά in *Nem.* x. 46.—The preoccupation referred to is the composition of a paean to the Delian Apollo: see *Introduction* and below l. 6.—The comparative of ὑπέρ in Pindar is always ὑπέρτερος; for the superlative he has both ὑπέρτατος and ὑπερώτατος.

3. **μή μοι** κ.τ.λ.] *May craggy Delos, in whose service my soul has been shed, not be wroth with me.* **κραναός**, applied to Athens in *Nem.* xiii. 11, is equivalent to τραχύς. **νεμεσάσαι** from νεμεσάω: in Pindar only here.

4. **ἐν ᾇ κέχυμαι**] This strange phrase, which has no parallel in early Greek writers, has been questioned. Hartung conjectured τέταμαι, quoting *Pyth.* xi. 54 ξυναῖσι δ' ἀμφ' ἀρεταῖς τέταμαι (ἔγκειμαι being the scholiast's paraphrase in both passages). This conjecture however does not explain the origin of κέχυμαι. If we take into account the later usage of κέχυμαι with εἰς, πρός, 'to be all given to' (for which see Liddell and Scott *sub* χέω), we may be ready to believe that, though this usage may not have yet come in, the verb was susceptible even in Pindar's time of such

*τί φίλτερον κεδνῶν τοκέων ἀγαθοῖς;* 5
*εἶξον, ὦ 'πολλωνιάς· ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων σὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω τέλος,*

an application, then perhaps bold even in poetry. A verse of the obscure (probably Alexandrine) poet Lycophronides is quoted by Bergk in support of the text (*P.L.G.* p. 634, fr. 2, 3) ἐπεί μοι νόος ἄλλα κέχυται ἐπὶ τὰν Χάρισιν φίλαν παῖδα καὶ καλάν.—Making up our minds to accept κέχυμαι we may be sure that **ἐν** is right and need not entertain Rauchenstein's ἐφ' (cp. schol. ἐφ' ᾗ νῦν πᾶς ἔγκειμαι). ἐν means 'in the case of', 'in dealing with'. Herwerden (*Pindarica* p. 30) proposed ἐν ἄν, Boeotian for ἐς ἄν.

5. **τί** κ.τ.λ.] This verse takes up μᾶτερ ἐμά, and assigns a reason for the preference given to Theba. But it may also have a secondary bearing on the relations of Herodotus to Asopodorus.

6. **εἶξον** κ.τ.λ.] *Yield, thou that art Apollo's, knowing that by the favour of the gods I shall yoke together the particular ends of both gracious works, quiring in honour of unshorn Phoebus both in water-girt Ceos, with seafaring men, and on the floor of Isthmus' neck which severs seas.* Mr Fennell rightly takes **ὦ 'πολλωνιάς** of Delos personified (corresponding to Theba), not of the island.—ἀμφοτέροις is the reading of D, but B, offering the unmeaning ἀμφοτέραν, suggests the true reading **ἀμφοτερᾶν** restored by Boeckh and confirmed by the scholium: δύο χαρίτων.

Commentators seem not to have fully realised the difficulties of this passage; they certainly have not apprehended its meaning. In the first place, what are the two χάριτες? On this point two explanations are offered in the scholia. (1) μιᾶς μέν, ὅτι αὐτῇ τὸ ἀσυμπέραστον γράφει ποίημα, δευτέρας δὲ ὅτι πεισθεῖσα ὑπεχώρησε τῷ νῦν τοῦ Ἡροδότου ἐγκωμίῳ. According to this note, χάριτες means favours bestowed by Delos (or Ceos?), one being the original commission to write the poem, the other her courtesy in giving place to Theba. Thus when Pindar completes the poem he will have a double debt to pay. But this interpretation is not consistent with the tenor of the following lines, which are evidently an expansion of the clause under consideration. (2) ἀμφοτέρων τῶν χαρίτων τὸ τέλος συζεύξω, καθ' ἥν τε σοὶ χαριστέον ἐστὶ καὶ καθ' ἣν τῇ πατρίδι. οἱονεὶ ἀμφότερα ποιήσω, καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ἐν ᾧ δεῖ καιρῷ ὑμνήσω καὶ τὸν ἐπίνικον πληρώσω. That is, 'I shall fulfil both gracious tasks, that for Apollo and that for Theba, in due time'. This is the explanation given by Dissen and most generally received. But there is little point in such a statement. Moreover this explanation does not do justice to ζεύξω τέλος. Mr Fennell rejects Dissen's *utriusque hymni cum diis pertexam finem*, but I cannot say that I quite understand his own view as conveyed in the translation 'I shall combine the performance of both obligations'. How are they to be combined?

It is clear that the two χάριτες can be no other than the two poems in question: that which is before us and that which for its sake Pindar postponed. These two poems are in some manner to be yoked together; what is the ζυγόν? It must surely be the praise of Apollo, mentioned in the following participial clause. If Apollo is to be celebrated presently at Ceos and is also here, in these first lines, praised at Isthmus, the poet might regard the hymns as in a certain sense yoked. *The praise of Apollo is a* τέλος *common to both.* This explanation involves a slight change in l. 9 (see note). **τοι**, 'you know', introduces a statement intended to overcome any reluctance on the part of Delos to

καὶ τὸν ἀκειρεκόμαν Φοῖβον χορεύων — ἀντ. α΄.
ἐν Κέῳ ἀμφιρύτᾳ σὺν ποντίοις
ἀνδράσιν, κὰν τὰν ἀλιϝερκέα Ἰσθμοῦ
δειράδ᾽· ἐπεὶ στεφάνους — 10
ἐξ ὤπασεν Κάδμου στρατῷ ἐξ ἀέθλων,

yield.—**χαρίτων**, *sweet* or *gracious services*, here the ode to Herodotus and the paean. Cp. *Isth.* III. A 8.—The force of **τέλος** is illustrated by the phrase in l. 27 below, ἐφ᾽ ἑκάστῳ ἔργματι κεῖτο τέλος, each event had its own end, was independent of the others. So the two poems were originally independent, had each a τέλος of its own. Their accidental association suggested to Pindar that he might make them, to some extent, interdependent by introducing into the first an anticipatory reference to the subject of the second. They might thus in some measure be considered a pair; for the paean, not yet completed, must be supplemented by these introductory verses.

7. **ἀκειρεκόμαν**] In Pindar only here and *Pyth.* III. 14. In Homer (Υ 39; Hymn to Apollo, 134) the form handed down ἀκερσεκόμης, but the original Aeolic must have been ἀκερρεκόμας. Pausanias (V. 22, 2) gives a dedicatory distich on a gift sent to Olympia by the inhabitants of Apollonia:

μνάματ᾽ Ἀπολλωνίας ἀνακείμεθα, τὰν ἐνὶ πόντῳ
Ἰονίῳ Φοῖβος ᾤκισ᾽ ἀκερσεκόμας.

In early art Apollo is represented with long locks, sometimes plaited.—For **χορεύων** with an accusative of the deity honoured by the choros, compare Sophocles, *Antigone*, 1153 χορεύουσι τὸν ταμίαν Ἴακχον. In Euripides ἑλίσσω has the same construction; *Heracles*, 690 τὸν Λατοῦς εὔπαιδα γόνον εἱλίσσουσαι.

8. **ἐν Κέῳ**] Perhaps at the temple of Apollo at Carthaea, one of the chief cities of Ceos (Dissen and Fennell).—**ἀμφιρύτᾳ** (ἀμφιρύτα D, ἀμφιρρύτα B), only here in Pindar. For the declension of compound adjectives in Pindar see note on *Nemean* III. 2. Cp. Alcman *fr.* 21 Πάφον περιρρύταν, and *frag. adesp.* 101 (Bergk III. p. 722) Τένεδός τε περιρρύτα (add Sappho's φωνὰν ἀκαμάταν, *fr.* 118, 2, ed. Bergk). περίρρυτος, frequent in poetry of islands (as in *Philoctetes*, 1) is not found in Pindar.—**ποντίοις ἀνδράσιν**, schol. τοῖς νησιώταις ἀνδράσι.

9. **κὰν**] For καὶ ἀνά.—MSS. καί, not questioned by previous editors. But it is clear that τὰν ἀλιϝερκέα Ἰσθμοῦ δειράδ᾽ is parallel to Κέῳ ἀμφιρύτᾳ not to Φοῖβον (to which Poseidon would correspond). The point is that Apollo will be praised at Isthmus as well as at Ceos; see note on l. 6.—The reading of the MSS. καί was a conscious correction of κάν falsely interpreted as καὶ ἐν. For ἀνά see *Appendix* H.—For **ἀλιϝερκέα**, cp. *Ol.* VIII. 25, where it is used of an island (Aegina) and *Pyth.* I. 18 ταί θ᾽ ὑπὲρ Κύμας ἀλιϝερκέες ὄχθαι, *sea-fenced banks*. Here too it is generally taken *sea-hedged*, but Mr Fennell translates 'barring sea from sea', thus making the Isthmus a ἕρκος of the sea, not the sea of the Isthmus. Hermann reads ἀλιερκέος, as the hiatus before Ἰσθμοῦ, for which a digamma cannot be established, is certainly curious.—**δειράδα**: cp. *Ol.* VIII. 52 Κορίνθου δειράδ᾽, where schol. interprets ὁ δὲ Ἰσθμὸς στενοῦται ὡς ἐπὶ σώματι τραχηλός, rightly I believe, though commentators take δειράς = *jugum*.

11. **ἐξ ὤπασεν**] *Since he* (Phoebus) *bestowed six crowns from games on the host of Cadmus, a glory of fair victory to my country.*—Phoebus is the subject of **ὤπασεν** as Aristodemus of Alexandria pointed out, schol. (Abel, p. 359): τὸ δὲ ὤπασεν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος· προστάτης γὰρ τῶν ἀγώνων ὁ θεός. ἐξ οὖν προνοίᾳ φησὶ τοῦ θεοῦ νενικηκέναι τὸν Ἡρόδοτον, οὐκ

*καλλίνικον πατρίδι κῦδος. ἐν ᾇ καὶ τὸν ἀδείμαντον Ἀλκμήνα τέκεν*

*παῖδα, θρασεῖαι τόν ποτε Γηρυόνα φρίξαν κύνες.* ἐπ. α'.

Ἰσθμικοὺς ἀγῶνας ἀλλὰ συμμίκτους (the six are enumerated l. 52, sqq.).—According to the usual interpretation Ἰσθμός is subject of ὤπασεν and the six wreaths were won by various Thebans at the recent Isthmian games. My view of the preceding lines implies that Phoebus was the giver; the general ἐξ ἀέθλων does not define at what contests the crowns were won. The punctual enumeration of *six* victories in l. 52 sqq. strongly confirms this explanation, which coincides with that of Aristodemus.

**στρατός** (applied to the Thebans in *Nem.* I. 61) here means specially those who presented themselves to take part in games; *the champions of Thebes*. Cp. Ἕλλανα στρατόν, *Nem.* X. 25. But Pindar often uses στρατός for *people*, as in *Pyth.* I. 86 νώμα δικαίῳ πηδαλίῳ στρατόν, just as Sophocles uses στόλος, *Oed. Tyr.* 169 νοσεῖ δέ μοι πρόπας στόλος.—**ἐξ ἀέθλων**, closely with στεφάνους, as the source of the wreaths. The ἄεθλα meant were (1) the Isthmian, (2) Iolaea or Heraclia at Thebes, (3) Minyea at Orchomenus, (4) Eleusinia, (5) perhaps Geraestia, in Euboea, (6) Protesilaea at Phylace; see below l. 52 sqq.

12. **πατρίδι**] *My country* (hence χορεύω). πᾰτρίς occurs three times in Pindar (*Ol.* X. 36, *Pyth.* IV. 98); πάτρα in the same sense is more frequent. The first syllable of πάτρα is generally short in Pindar, five times long, once common. In the declension of πατήρ, the vowel before τρ is 21 times short, 18 times long, once common. πᾰτραδελφεός, πᾰτροπάτωρ, πᾰτρίς, πᾰτριος, πᾰτρόθεν do not vary. πᾰ́τρως is found once, and πᾰ́τραθε likewise. πᾰτρώιος is usual, but six times πᾱτρώιος, twice πᾰτρώιος.

**ἐν ᾇ**] scil. πατρίδι. *In which country also Alcmena bare the intrepid child, who once on a time sent a shudder through the fierce dogs of Geryon.*—**καί** suggests that Thebes has ancient as well as modern glories to be proud of.—**ἀδείμαντον** of the seed from which Heracles sprung in *Nem.* X. 17; an uncommon word, also found in Aeschylus (*Persae*, 162).—**τέκεν**, restored by Boeckh for τέκε.

13. **φρίξαν**] With an object this word is rare in Pindar, elsewhere occurring only in *Ol.* VII. 38 Οὐρανὸς δ' ἔφριξέ νιν.

The earliest mention of the myth of Geryonês is in Hesiod, *Theogony* 287—294, where we find the main features of the fuller story told by Apollodorus (*Bibliotheca* II. 5, 10) as the tenth labour of Heracles. Geryonês lived in Erythea, an island of Ocean, near Gadira, and the herdman Eurytion with the dog Orthros kept his dark red kine (φοινικᾶς βόας, Apollodorus). Geryonês had three heads (τρικέφαλον, lege τρικάρηνον, Hesiod); according to Apollodorus, the dog had two. But in all the legends, only one dog is mentioned (Orthros, according to Pollux, V. 46, called Gargethos in Iberia), so that Pindar's κύνας is surprising. The scholiast suggests that Pindar is given to exaggeration (Abel, p. 360): ἔθος τῷ Πινδάρῳ πρὸς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ συμφέρον καὶ τὰς ἱστορίας βιάζεσθαι. ἑνὸς γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ Γηρυόνου κυνός, ὥς γε καὶ Ἡσίοδος μαρτυρεῖ,

Ὄρθον τε κτείνας καὶ βουκόλον Εὐρυτίωνα,
αὐτὸς τῷ πληθυντικῷ καταχρησάμενος κύνες φησί. He adds that Pindar may have considered it unworthy of Heracles to confront him with a single dog. In the other passage where Pindar refers to Geryones he only mentions the oxen, *frag.* 169, 5 ἐπεὶ Γηρυόνα βόας...ἀναιτήτας τε καὶ ἀπριάτας ἤλασεν.—If we remember

καλλίνικον πατρίδι κῦδος. ἐν ᾇ καὶ τὸν ἀδείμαντον Ἀλκμήνα τέκεν

παῖδα, θρασεῖαι τόν ποτε Γηρυόνα φρίξαν κύνες. ἐπ. α'.

Ἰσθμικοὺς ἀγῶνας ἀλλὰ συμμίκτους (the six are enumerated l. 52, sqq.).—According to the usual interpretation Ἰσθμὸς is subject of ὤπασεν and the six wreaths were won by various Thebans at the recent Isthmian games. My view of the preceding lines implies that Phoebus was the giver; the general ἐξ ἀέθλων does not define at what contests the crowns were won. The punctual enumeration of *six* victories in l. 52 sqq. strongly confirms this explanation, which coincides with that of Aristodemus.

**στρατὸς** (applied to the Thebans in *Nem.* I. 61) here means specially those who presented themselves to take part in games; *the champions of Thebes.* Cp. Ἕλλανα στρατόν, *Nem.* X. 25. But Pindar often uses στρατὸς for *people*, as in *Pyth.* I. 86 νώμα δικαίῳ πηδαλίῳ στρατόν, just as Sophocles uses στόλος, *Oed. Tyr.* 169 νοσεῖ δέ μοι πρόπας στόλος.—**ἐξ ἀέθλων**, closely with στεφάνους, as the source of the wreaths. The ἄεθλα meant were (1) the Isthmian, (2) Iolaea or Heraclia at Thebes, (3) Minyea at Orchomenus, (4) Eleusinia, (5) perhaps Geraestia, in Euboea, (6) Protesilaea at Phylace; see below l. 52 sqq.

12. **πατρίδι**] *My country* (hence χορεύω). πᾰτρὶς occurs three times in Pindar (*Ol.* X. 36, *Pyth.* IV. 98); πάτρα in the same sense is more frequent. The first syllable of πάτρα is generally short in Pindar, five times long, once common. In the declension of πατήρ, the vowel before τρ is 21 times short, 18 times long, once common. πᾰτραδελφεός, πᾰτροπάτωρ, πᾰτρίς, πᾰτριος, πᾰτροθεν do not vary. πᾰτρως is found once, and πᾰτραθε likewise. πᾰτρώιος is usual, but six times πᾱτρώιος, twice πᾱτρώιος.

**ἐν ᾇ**] scil. πατρίδι. *In which country also Alcmena bare the intrepid child, who once on a time sent a shudder through the fierce dogs of Geryon.*—**καί** suggests that Thebes has ancient as well as modern glories to be proud of.—**ἀδείμαντον** of the seed from which Heracles sprung in *Nem.* X. 17; an uncommon word, also found in Aeschylus (*Persae*, 162).—**τέκεν**, restored by Boeckh for τέκε.

13. **φρίξαν**] With an object this word is rare in Pindar, elsewhere occurring only in *Ol.* VII. 38 Οὐρανὸς δ' ἔφριξέ νιν.

The earliest mention of the myth of Geryonês is in Hesiod, *Theogony* 287—294, where we find the main features of the fuller story told by Apollodorus (*Bibliotheca* II. 5, 10) as the tenth labour of Heracles. Geryonês lived in Erythea, an island of Ocean, near Gadira, and the herdman Eurytion with the dog Orthros kept his dark red kine (φοινικᾶς βόας, Apollodorus). Geryonês had three heads (τρικέφαλον, lege τρικάρηνον, Hesiod); according to Apollodorus, the dog had two. But in all the legends, only one dog is mentioned (Orthros, according to Pollux, V. 46, called Gargethos in Iberia), so that Pindar's κύνας is surprising. The scholiast suggests that Pindar is given to exaggeration (Abel, p. 360): ἔθος τῷ Πινδάρῳ πρὸς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ συμφέρον καὶ τὰς ἱστορίας βιάζεσθαι. ἑνὸς γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ Γηρυόνου κυνός, ὥς γε καὶ Ἡσίοδος μαρτυρεῖ,

Ὄρθον τε κτείνας καὶ βουκόλον Εὐρυτίωνα,

αὐτὸς τῷ πληθυντικῷ καταχρησάμενος κύνες φησί. He adds that Pindar may have considered it unworthy of Heracles to confront him with a single dog. In the other passage where Pindar refers to Geryones he only mentions the oxen, *frag.* 169, 5 ἐπεὶ Γηρυόνα βόας...ἀναιτήτας τε καὶ ἀπριάτας ἤλασεν.—If we remember

ἀλλ' ἐγὼ Ἡροδότῳ τεύχω τὸ μὲν ἅρματι τεθρίππῳ γέρας,
ἀνία τ' ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντ' ἐθέλω 15
ἢ Καστορείῳ ἢ Ἰολάοι' ἐναρμόξαι νιν ὕμνῳ.

that Apollodorus gives the dog two heads (δικέφαλον) and that Orthros is represented on a Cyprian relief (printed in Roscher's *Lexikon der gr. und röm. Mythologie*, p. 1635) with three heads, we can understand that Pindar might have regarded the dog as in a certain sense plural.—**Γηρυόνα** from Γηρυόνης. The form in Hesiod is Γηρυονεύς, Γηρυονῆι. On a Chalcidian vase (*C. I. G.* 7582) we find Γαρυϝόνης.

14. **ἀλλ' ἐγὼ** κ.τ.λ.] The MSS. have τεύχων τὸ μὲν ἅρματι and ἀνία τ'. The scholia recognize τὸ μὲν (p. 360: ἀλλ ἐγὼ τῷ Ἡροδότῳ κατασκευάζων τὸ μὲν ὕμνον ὅτι τεθρίππῳ αὐτὸς ἀγωνισάμενος δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἐνίκησε· τὸ δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἱπποτρόφησεν, αὐτὸν βούλομαι ἐφαρμόσαι ἢ Κάστορος ἢ Ἰολάου ὕμνῳ). As the text stands in the MSS. we cannot translate it fairly. μέν is supposed to be answered by τε; and the participle τεύχων to be coordinate with ἐθέλω. If we keep τὸ μέν, it is necessary to read **τεύχω**; then **τ'** may be explained as taking the place of τὸ δέ (see *Appendix* A), owing to a change of construction. If the sentence had continued according to its first purpose, it would have been something like this: ἀλλ' ἐγὼ Ἡροδότῳ τεύχω, τὸ μὲν ἅρματι τεθρ. γέρας, τὸ δὲ Καστόρειον ἢ Ἰολ. ὕμνον, (ὡς) ἀνία ἀλλ. οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντι.—Various emendations have been proposed. Hartung conjectured

τεύχων μέλος, ἅρματι τεθρίππῳ γέρας,
ἀνί' ἐν κ.τ.λ.

which gives a simple construction, but does not explain the corruption. Christ reads τεύχειν (the construction being ἐθέλω τὸ μὲν—τεύχειν, ἀνία τ'—ἐναρμόξαι). M. Schmidt proposed τορόν for τὸ μὲν, while Bergk guesses τεθμὸν ἅρματι—ἀνί' ἅτ'. Against Bergk's suggestion it may be urged that τεθμόν is far from τὸ μέν, and, as he himself admits, that ἅτε in Pindar always has a comparative sense.—I suggest δόμεν (which form occurs in *Ol.* VIII. 85) involving the change of only a single letter. τὸ μὲν however might have been a designed correction, not an accidental corruption, some one not apprehending that τ' connects δόμεν with ἐναρμόξαι, and that γέρας depends on both τεύχων and δόμεν. For meaning cp. below l. 45 δόσις. We should then render: *But I am fain to frame a gift for Herodotus, an honour for his four-horsed chariot, and to harness him, for that he guided not the reins with the hands of others, to a strain worthy of Castor or Iolaos.* But τεύχω is the simplest correction, and it preserves the idiomatic use of τε.

For **τεύχω** of a hymn cp. *Pyth.* XII. 19 τεῦχε πάμφωνον μέλος, and *Pyth.* I. 4. Here it signals to **τεύχοντ'** below, l. 67, just as in *Nem.* IV. τεύχει in l. 4 responds to τεύχει in l. 84. See above, *Introduction*, p. 7.—In *Pyth.* V. 31 we have ἀρισθάρματον γέρας of a crown won in a chariot race (so *Ol.* II. 9 γέρας ἔδεκτο). Here γέρας means the gift of song which honours a victory. It is an honour in which the triumphant chariot is conceived to be interested.

15. **νωμάσαντ'**] For νωμᾶν with ἀνία cp. *Pyth.* IV. 18. νωμάω has the two meanings *ply* and *guide* (as in πᾶν δ' ἐπὶ τέρμα νωμᾷ *Agam.* 781). A scholium has ἐλλείπει διὰ τὸ νωμᾶσθαι, which must not however lead us to suppose with Hartung that the scholiast had νωμᾶσθαι in his text and explained it by the ellipse of δέ. We must rather believe that the note has been mutilated. Perhaps it began thus: ἐλλείπει τὸ δὲ and ended by explaining νωμάσαντα by διὰ τὸ νωμᾶσθαι.

16. **Καστορείῳ**] Observe that the long final diphthong is not shortened by the

τί φίλτερον κεδνῶν τοκέων ἀγαθοῖς; 5
εἶξον, ὦ 'πολλωνιάς· ἀμφοτερᾶν τοι χαρίτων σὺν θεοῖς ζεύξω
τέλος,

an application, then perhaps bold even in poetry. A verse of the obscure (probably Alexandrine) poet Lycophronides is quoted by Bergk in support of the text (*P.L.G.* p. 634, fr. 2, 3) ἐπεί μοι νόος ἄλλα κέχυται ἐπὶ τὰν Χάρισιν φίλαν παΐδα καὶ καλάν.—Making up our minds to accept κέχυμαι we may be sure that ἐν is right and need not entertain Rauchenstein's ἐφ' (cp. schol. ἐφ' ᾗ νῦν πᾶς ἔγκειμαι). ἐν means 'in the case of', 'in dealing with'. Herwerden (*Pindarica* p. 30) proposed ἐν ἄν, Boeotian for ἐς ἄν.

5. τί κ.τ.λ.] This verse takes up μᾶτερ ἐμά, and assigns a reason for the preference given to Theba. But it may also have a secondary bearing on the relations of Herodotus to Asopodorus.

6. **εἶξον** κ.τ.λ.] *Yield, thou that art Apollo's, knowing that by the favour of the gods I shall yoke together the particular ends of both gracious works, quiring in honour of unshorn Phoebus both in watergirt Ceos, with seafaring men, and on the floor of Isthmus' neck which severs seas.* Mr Fennell rightly takes **ὦ 'πολλωνιάς** of Delos personified (corresponding to Theba), not of the island.—ἀμφοτέροις is the reading of D, but B, offering the unmeaning ἀμφοτέραν, suggests the true reading **ἀμφοτερᾶν** restored by Boeckh and confirmed by the scholium: δύο χαρίτων.

Commentators seem not to have fully realised the difficulties of this passage; they certainly have not apprehended its meaning. In the first place, what are the two χάριτες? On this point two explanations are offered in the scholia. (1) μιᾶς μέν, ὅτι αὐτῇ τὸ ἀσυμπέρασπον γράφει ποίημα, δευτέρας δὲ ὅτι πεισθεῖσα ὑπεχώρησε τῷ νῦν τοῦ Ἡροδότου ἐγκωμίῳ. According to this note, χάριτες means favours bestowed by Delos (or Ceos?), one being the original commission to write the poem, the other her courtesy in giving place to Theba. Thus when Pindar completes the poem he will have a double debt to pay. But this interpretation is not consistent with the tenor of the following lines, which are evidently an expansion of the clause under consideration. (2) ἀμφοτέρων τῶν χαρίτων τὸ τέλος συζεύξω, καθ' ἥν τε σοὶ χαριστέον ἐστὶ καὶ καθ' ἥν τῇ πατρίδι. οἱονεὶ ἀμφότερα ποιήσω, καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ἐν ᾧ δεῖ καιρῷ ὑμνήσω καὶ τὸν ἐπίνικον πληρώσω. That is, 'I shall fulfil both gracious tasks, that for Apollo and that for Theba, in due time'. This is the explanation given by Dissen and most generally received. But there is little point in such a statement. Moreover this explanation does not do justice to ζεύξω τέλος. Mr Fennell rejects Dissen's *utriusque hymni cum diis pertexam finem*, but I cannot say that I quite understand his own view as conveyed in the translation 'I shall combine the performance of both obligations'. How are they to be combined?

It is clear that the two χάριτες can be no other than the two poems in question: that which is before us and that which for its sake Pindar postponed. These two poems are in some manner to be yoked together; what is the ζυγόν? It must surely be the praise of Apollo, mentioned in the following participial clause. If Apollo is to be celebrated presently at Ceos and is also here, in these first lines, praised at Isthmus, the poet might regard the hymns as in a certain sense yoked. *The praise of Apollo is a* τέλος *common to both.* This explanation involves a slight change in l. 9 (see note). **τοι**, 'you know', introduces a statement intended to overcome any reluctance on the part of Delos to

*καὶ τὸν ἀκειρεκόμαν Φοῖβον χορεύων* — ἀντ. α'.
*ἐν Κέῳ ἀμφιρύτᾳ σὺν ποντίοις*
*ἀνδράσιν, κὰν τὰν ἀλιϝερκέα Ἰσθμοῦ*
*δειράδ᾽· ἐπεὶ στεφάνους* — 10
*ἓξ ὤπασεν Κάδμου στρατῷ ἐξ ἀέθλων,*

yield.—**χαρίτων**, *sweet* or *gracious services*, here the ode to Herodotus and the paean. Cp. *Isth.* III. A 8.—The force of **τέλος** is illustrated by the phrase in l. 27 below, ἐφ᾽ ἑκάστῳ ἔργματι κεῖτο τέλος, each event had its own end, was independent of the others. So the two poems were originally independent, had each a τέλος of its own. Their accidental association suggested to Pindar that he might make them, to some extent, interdependent by introducing into the first an anticipatory reference to the subject of the second. They might thus in some measure be considered a pair; for the paean, not yet completed, must be supplemented by these introductory verses.

7. **ἀκειρεκόμαν**] In Pindar only here and *Pyth.* III. 14. In Homer (Υ 39; Hymn to Apollo, 134) the form handed down ἀκερσεκόμης, but the original Aeolic must have been ἀκερρεκόμας. Pausanias (V. 22, 2) gives a dedicatory distich on a gift sent to Olympia by the inhabitants of Apollonia:

μνάματ᾽ Ἀπολλωνίας ἀνακείμεθα, τὰν ἐνὶ πόντῳ
Ἰονίῳ Φοῖβος ᾤκισ᾽ ἀκερσεκόμας.

In early art Apollo is represented with long locks, sometimes plaited.—For **χορεύων** with an accusative of the deity honoured by the choros, compare Sophocles, *Antigone*, 1153 χορεύουσι τὸν ταμίαν Ἴακχον. In Euripides ἑλίσσω has the same construction; *Heracles*, 690 τὸν Λατοῦς εὔπαιδα γόνον εἱλίσσουσαι.

8. **ἐν Κέῳ**] Perhaps at the temple of Apollo at Carthaea, one of the chief cities of Ceos (Dissen and Fennell).—**ἀμφιρύτᾳ** (ἀμφιρύτα D, ἀμφιρρύτα B), only here in Pindar. For the declension of compound adjectives in Pindar see note on *Nemean* III. 2. Cp. Alcman *fr.* 21 Πάφον περιρρύταν, and *frag. adesp.* 101 (Bergk III. p. 722) Τένεδός τε περιρρύτα (add Sappho's φωνὰν ἀκαμάταν, *fr.* 118, 2, ed. Bergk). περίρρυτος, frequent in poetry of islands (as in *Philoctetes*, 1) is not found in Pindar.—**ποντίοις ἀνδράσιν**, schol. τοῖς νησιώταις ἀνδράσι.

9. **κὰν**] For καὶ ἀνά.—MSS. καί, not questioned by previous editors. But it is clear that τὰν ἀλιϝερκέα Ἰσθμοῦ δειράδ᾽ is parallel to Κέῳ ἀμφιρύτᾳ not to Φοῖβον (to which Poseidon would correspond). The point is that Apollo will be praised at Isthmus as well as at Ceos; see note on l. 6.—The reading of the MSS. καί was a conscious correction of κὰν falsely interpreted as καὶ ἐν. For ἀνά see *Appendix* H.—For **ἀλιϝερκέα**, cp. *Ol.* VIII. 25, where it is used of an island (Aegina) and *Pyth.* I. 18 ταί θ᾽ ὑπὲρ Κύμας ἀλιϝερκέες ὄχθαι, *sea-fenced banks*. Here too it is generally taken *sea-hedged*, but Mr Fennell translates 'barring sea from sea', thus making the Isthmus a ἕρκος of the sea, not the sea of the Isthmus. Hermann reads ἀλιερκέος, as the hiatus before Ἰσθμοῦ, for which a digamma cannot be established, is certainly curious.—**δειράδα**: cp. *Ol.* VIII. 52 Κορίνθου δειράδ᾽, where schol. interprets ὁ δὲ Ἰσθμὸς στενοῦται ὡς ἐπὶ σώματι τραχηλός, rightly I believe, though commentators take δειράς = *jugum*.

11. **ἓξ ὤπασεν**] *Since he* (Phoebus) *bestowed six crowns from games on the host of Cadmus, a glory of fair victory to my country.*—Phoebus is the subject of **ὤπασεν** as Aristodemus of Alexandria pointed out, schol. (Abel, p. 359): τὸ δὲ ὤπασεν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος· προστάτης γὰρ τῶν ἀγώνων ὁ θεός. ἐξ οὖν προνοίᾳ φησὶ τοῦ θεοῦ νενικηκέναι τὸν Ἡρόδοτον, οὐκ

καλλίνικον πατρίδι κῦδος. ἐν ᾇ καὶ τὸν ἀδείμαντον Ἀλκμήνα τέκεν

παῖδα, θρασεῖαι τόν ποτε Γηρυόνα φρίξαν κύνες. ἐπ. α'.

Ἰσθμικοὺς ἀγῶνας ἀλλὰ συμμίκτους (the six are enumerated l. 52, sqq.).—According to the usual interpretation Ἰσθμός is subject of ὤπασεν and the six wreaths were won by various Thebans at the recent Isthmian games. My view of the preceding lines implies that Phoebus was the giver; the general ἐξ ἀέθλων does not define at what contests the crowns were won. The punctual enumeration of *six* victories in l. 52 sqq. strongly confirms this explanation, which coincides with that of Aristodemus.

**στρατός** (applied to the Thebans in *Nem.* I. 61) here means specially those who presented themselves to take part in games; *the champions of Thebes*. Cp. Ἕλλανα στρατόν, *Nem.* X. 25. But Pindar often uses στρατός for *people*, as in *Pyth.* I. 86 νώμα δικαίῳ πηδαλίῳ στρατόν, just as Sophocles uses στόλος, *Oed. Tyr.* 169 νοσεῖ δέ μοι πρόπας στόλος.—**ἐξ ἀέθλων**, closely with στεφάνους, as the source of the wreaths. The ἄεθλα meant were (1) the Isthmian, (2) Iolaea or Heraclia at Thebes, (3) Minyea at Orchomenus, (4) Eleusinia, (5) perhaps Geraestia, in Euboea, (6) Protesilaea at Phylace; see below l. 52 sqq.

12. **πατρίδι**] *My country* (hence χορεύω). πᾰτρίς occurs three times in Pindar (*Ol.* X. 36, *Pyth.* IV. 98); πάτρα in the same sense is more frequent. The first syllable of πάτρα is generally short in Pindar, five times long, once common. In the declension of πατήρ, the vowel before τρ is 21 times short, 18 times long, once common. πᾰτραδελφεός, πᾰτροπάτωρ, πᾰτρίς, πᾰτριος, πᾰτροθεν do not vary. πᾰτρως is found once, and πά̆τραθε likewise. πᾰτρώιος is usual, but six times πᾱτρώιος, twice πᾰτρώιος.

**ἐν ᾇ**] scil. πατρίδι. *In which country also Alcmena bare the intrepid child, who once on a time sent a shudder through the fierce dogs of Geryon.*—**καί** suggests that Thebes has ancient as well as modern glories to be proud of.—**ἀδείμαντον** of the seed from which Heracles sprung in *Nem.* X. 17; an uncommon word, also found in Aeschylus (*Persae*, 162).—**τέκεν**, restored by Boeckh for τέκε.

13. **φρίξαν**] With an object this word is rare in Pindar, elsewhere occurring only in *Ol.* VII. 38 Οὐρανὸς δ' ἔφριξέ νιν.

The earliest mention of the myth of Geryonês is in Hesiod, *Theogony* 287—294, where we find the main features of the fuller story told by Apollodorus (*Bibliotheca* II. 5, 10) as the tenth labour of Heracles. Geryonês lived in Erythea, an island of Ocean, near Gadira, and the herdman Eurytion with the dog Orthros kept his dark red kine (φοινικᾶς βόας, Apollodorus). Geryonês had three heads (τρικέφαλον, lege τρικάρηνον, Hesiod); according to Apollodorus, the dog had two. But in all the legends, only one dog is mentioned (Orthros, according to Pollux, V. 46, called Gargethos in Iberia), so that Pindar's κύνας is surprising. The scholiast suggests that Pindar is given to exaggeration (Abel, p. 360): ἔθος τῷ Πινδάρῳ πρὸς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ συμφέρον καὶ τὰς ἱστορίας βιάζεσθαι. ἑνὸς γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ Γηρυόνου κυνός, ὥς γε καὶ Ἡσίοδος μαρτυρεῖ,

Ὄρθον τε κτείνας καὶ βουκόλον Εὐρυτίωνα,

αὐτὸς τῷ πληθυντικῷ καταχρησάμενος κύνες φησί. He adds that Pindar may have considered it unworthy of Heracles to confront him with a single dog. In the other passage where Pindar refers to Geryones he only mentions the oxen, *frag.* 169, 5 ἐπεὶ Γηρυόνα βόας...ἀναιτήτας τε καὶ ἀπριάτας ἤλασεν.—If we remember

ἀλλ' ἐγὼ Ἡροδότῳ τεύχω τὸ μὲν ἅρματι τεθρίππῳ γέρας,
ἀνία τ' ἀλλοτρίαις οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντ' ἐθέλω 15
ἢ Καστορείῳ ἢ Ἰολάοι' ἐναρμόξαι νιν ὕμνῳ.

that Apollodorus gives the dog two heads (δικέφαλον) and that Orthros is represented on a Cyprian relief (printed in Roscher's *Lexikon der gr. und röm. Mythologie*, p. 1635) with three heads, we can understand that Pindar might have regarded the dog as in a certain sense plural.—**Γηρυόνα** from Γηρυόνης. The form in Hesiod is Γηρυονεύς, Γηρυονῆι. On a Chalcidian vase (*C. I. G.* 7582) we find Γαρυϝόνης.

14. **ἀλλ' ἐγὼ** κ.τ.λ.] The MSS. have τεύχων τὸ μὲν ἅρματι and ἀνία τ'. The scholia recognize τὸ μὲν (p. 360: ἀλλ ἐγὼ τῷ Ἡροδότῳ κατασκευάζων τὸ μὲν ὕμνον ὅτι τεθρίππῳ αὐτὸς ἀγωνισάμενος δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἐνίκησε· τὸ δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἱπποτρόφησεν, αὐτὸν βούλομαι ἐφαρμόσαι ἢ Κάστορος ἢ Ἰολάου ὕμνῳ). As the text stands in the MSS. we cannot translate it fairly. μέν is supposed to be answered by τε; and the participle τεύχων to be coordinate with ἐθέλω. If we keep τὸ μέν, it is necessary to read **τεύχω**; then τ' may be explained as taking the place of τὸ δέ (see *Appendix* A), owing to a change of construction. If the sentence had continued according to its first purpose, it would have been something like this: ἀλλ' ἐγὼ Ἡροδότῳ τεύχω, τὸ μὲν ἅρματι τεθρ. γέρας, τὸ δὲ Καστόρειον ἢ Ἰολ. ὕμνον, (ὡς) ἀνία ἀλλ. οὐ χερσὶ νωμάσαντι.—Various emendations have been proposed. Hartung conjectured

τεύχων μέλος, ἅρματι τεθρίππῳ γέρας,
ἀνί' ἐν κ.τ.λ.

which gives a simple construction, but does not explain the corruption. Christ reads τεύχειν (the construction being ἐθέλω τὸ μὲν—τεύχειν, ἀνία τ'—ἐναρμόξαι). M. Schmidt proposed τορόν for τὸ μέν, while Bergk guesses τεθμὸν ἅρματι—ἀνί' ἄτ'. Against Bergk's suggestion it may be urged that τεθμόν is far from τὸ μέν, and, as he himself admits, that ἅτε in Pindar always has a comparative sense. —I suggest δόμεν (which form occurs in *Ol.* VIII. 85) involving the change of only a single letter. τὸ μὲν however might have been a designed correction, not an accidental corruption, some one not apprehending that τ' connects δόμεν with ἐναρμόξαι, and that γέρας depends on both τεύχων and δόμεν. For meaning cp. below l. 45 δόσις. We should then render: *But I am fain to frame a gift for Herodotus, an honour for his four-horsed chariot, and to harness him, for that he guided not the reins with the hands of others, to a strain worthy of Castor or Iolaos.* But τεύχω is the simplest correction, and it preserves the idiomatic use of τε.

For **τεύχω** of a hymn cp. *Pyth.* XII. 19 τεῦχε πάμφωνον μέλος, and *Pyth.* I. 4. Here it signals to **τεύχοντ'** below, l. 67, just as in *Nem.* IV. τεύχει in l. 4 responds to τεύχει in l. 84. See above, *Introduction*, p. 7.—In *Pyth.* V. 31 we have ἀρισθάρματον γέρας of a crown won in a chariot race (so *Ol.* II. 9 γέρας ἔδεκτο). Here γέρας means the gift of song which honours a victory. It is an honour in which the triumphant chariot is conceived to be interested.

15. **νωμάσαντ'**] For νωμᾶν with ἀνία cp. *Pyth.* IV. 18. νωμάω has the two meanings *ply* and *guide* (as in πᾶν δ' ἐπὶ τέρμα νωμᾷ *Agam.* 781). A scholium has ἐλλείπει διὰ τὸ νωμᾶσθαι, which must not however lead us to suppose with Hartung that the scholiast had νωμᾶσθαι in his text and explained it by the ellipse of δέ. We must rather believe that the note has been mutilated. Perhaps it began thus: ἐλλείπει τὸ δὲ and ended by explaining νωμάσαντα by διὰ τὸ νωμᾶσθαι.

16. **Καστορείῳ**] Observe that the long final diphthong is not shortened by the

*οἷά τε χερσὶν, ἀκοντίζοντες αἰχμαῖς,* ἀντ. β'.
*καὶ λιθίνοις ὁπότ' ἐν δίσκοις ἵεν.* 25
*οὐ γὰρ ἦν πεντάθλιον, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ*
*ἔργματι κεῖτο τέλος)·*

24, 25. **οἷά τε κ.τ.λ.**] There are three views as to the construction of these lines. (1) Dissen supplies *ἔλαμπε σφίσιν ἀρετά* with *οἷα* (=*ὡς*), and *ὁπότε ἵεν* with *ἀκοντίζοντες αἰχμαῖς*: 'et quantopere fulgebat eorum virtus quum manibus iaculantes iacula certarent et saxeis quum discis contenderent!' (2) Mezger also regards the sentence as exclamatory (so too the scholiast: *τὸ δὲ οἷα θαυμαστικῶς*), but supplies *ἵεν* with *οἷα*. 'And how they hurled with their hands, darting javelins and when they cast with stone quoits'. (3) Mr Fennell writes; "I prefer, 'and as to the casts they made'; *καὶ* coupling *ἐν δίσκοις* to *ἀκοντίζοντες*"; but I do not quite understand how he takes *ὁπότε*.

According to my view of the passage, **τε** shews that the whole sentence *οἷα—ἵεν* is coordinate with the two clauses of the preceding line and depends on *λάμπει σαφὴς ἀρετά*. The excellence of the heroes is conspicuous in three fields; (1) *ἐν γυμνοῖσι σταδίοις*, (2) *ἐν ἀσπιδοδούποισιν ὁπλίταις δρόμοις*, (3) *ἐν τοιούτοις οἷα χερσὶν ἵεν*, *a ἀκοντίζοντες αἰχμαῖς*, *b ὁπότε ἐν λιθίνοις δίσκοις* (*ἵεν*). Observe that **χερσὶν** (as I have punctuated) goes with *οἷα ἵεν*, not with *ἀκοντίζοντες*, and that *ἵεν* is understood with *ὁπότε*: the participle *ἀκοντίζοντες* being coordinate with the relative clause *ὁπότε* (*ἵεν*).

Bergk and Christ think that Pindar wrote *αἰχμαίς*, the Aeolic accusative; but the dative is idiomatic with verbs of casting, and, when we recognize that *χερσὶν* belongs to *ἵεν*, there can be no objection to **αἰχμαῖς**. Nor is it a certain inference from the words of a scholium *ἀκοντίζοντες τὰ δόρατα* that the scholiast read *αἰχμάς* (as Kayser, Hartung, and Mommsen suppose). The technical name of the javelin used in the pentathlon was *ἀποτομάς* (see schol. on *αἰχμαῖς*: *ἃς ἀποτομάδας καλοῦσι*, Hesychius *sub voce ἀποτομάδα*, and Pollux III. 151).—The MSS. have *ὁπότε δίσκοις*. I have followed Boeckh and most editors in reading **ὁπότ' ἐν**, but would not explain *ἐν* as instrumental (cp. *ἀπύων ἐν αὐλοῖς*, *Ol.* V. 19). **ἐν δίσκοις** means *in discus-matches*. Mr Fennell well compares *Pyth.* XI. 46 *ἐν ἅρμασι καλλίνικοι*, *in chariot races*. Bergk reads *ὁπότ' ἐκ* (*i.e. ἐκ χερῶν ἵεν*), explaining *λιθίνοις δίσκοις* as an Aeolic accusative.—On *λιθίνοις* the Homeric verse (*θ* 190)

> *βόμβησεν δὲ λίθος κατὰ δ' ἔπτηξαν*
> *ποτὶ γαίῃ*

is cited in a scholium (p. 365).

26. **πεντάθλιον**] This form occurs also in *Pyth.* VIII. 66.—In the days of Castor and Iolaus there was not yet a pentathlon, with a single reward for him who proved himself best in three out of the five trials; but there were special prizes for quoit throwing and for javelin throwing, exercises which in Pindar's day no longer formed independent 'events'.—**ἦν**, ed. Rom. and Boeckh; B *ἢ ἒ*, D *ης*. MSS. *πένταθλον*, Boeckh *πεντάθλιον*. *ἦεν* in B was an attempt to restore the metre (Bergk).

**ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ κ.τ.λ.**] *But each exploit had its own conclusion;* or *for each achievement was set an end* (that is, a prize) *of its own.* Schol.: *τὸ δὲ κεῖτο τέλος ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦν ἰδιάζων καὶ ὁ στέφανος.* *τιθέναι* is the word for setting up a prize, cp. *Nem.* X. 48 *χαλκὸν ὃν θῆκε*; **κεῖτο** is the passive in this sense, cp. *Isth.* VI. 26. For **τέλος** of a prize, cp. *Ol.* XI. 67 *Δόρυκλος δ' ἔφερε πυγμᾶς τέλος*, 'won the

τῶν ἀθρόοις ἀνδησάμενοι θαμάκις
ἔρνεσιν χαίτας ῥεέθροισί τε Δίρκας ἔφανεν καὶ παρ' Εὐρώτα πέλας,

Ἰφικλέος μὲν παῖς ὁμόδαμος ἐὼν Σπαρτῶν γένει, ἐπ. β'. 30
Τυνδαρίδας δ' ἐν Ἀχαιοῖς ὑψίπεδον Θεράπνας οἰκέων ἕδος.
χαίρετ'. ἐγὼ δὲ Ποσειδάωνι Ἰσθμῷ τε ζαθέᾳ

prize for boxing'.—With **ἔργματι** (D ἔρματι) cp. *Nem.* I. 7 ἔργμασιν νικαφόροις. There is an echo below, l. 47.

28. **τῶν** κ.τ.λ.] The antecedent of **τῶν** is στεφάνων l. 21. *With multitudinous shoots whereof having many a time bound their locks, they shone at the streams of Dirce and hard by Eurotas.*—For **ἀθρόοις** cp. *Isth.* IV. 8 ἀθρόοι στέφανοι ἀνέδησαν ἔθειραν.—**θαμάκις**, also in *Nem.* X. 38.

29. **ἔρνεσιν**] Elsewhere ἔρνεα is used, without στεφάνων, in the sense of στέφανοι (cp. *Nem.* VI. 18, XI. 29) as below l. 66. Here it is serviceable in making clear that τῶν refers to στεφάνων.—**ἔφανεν** (Schmid for MSS. ἔφανε), Iolaus on the banks of Dirce, Castor on the Eurotas.—MSS. **Εὐρώτα**, Mingarelli Εὐρώτᾳ. παρά is supplied with **ῥεέθροισι** from παρ' Εὐρώτα (cp. *Nem.* IX. 14), and on the other hand ῥεέθροισι is supplied with Εὐρώτα. Mingarelli's correction, adopted by editors, is unnecessary. A scholiast rightly explains: πρὸς τὸ Εὐρώτα τὸ ῥεέθροις ἀκουστέον.

30. **Ἰφικλέος** κ.τ.λ.] *The son of Iphicles, being of one race with the Sown men there* (at Dirce), *but here* (at the Eurotas) *the son of Tyndareus, among Achaians, dwelling in the high-situate abode of Therapna.*—By calling Iolaus son of Iphicles Pindar reminds us that he was nephew of Heracles, who was mentioned in the first line of the first epode. The force of **μέν** and **δέ** here is almost distributive, apportioning Iolaus to Dirce and Castor to Eurotas.—**ὁμόδαμος**, properly *of the same deme*, then *of the same people*, also occurs in *Ol.* IX. 44 of the stone race of Deucalion and Pyrrha.—**γένει** depends on the first part of ὁμόδαμος.

31. **ἐν Ἀχαιοῖς**] Schol. Ἀχαιοὺς δὲ εἴρηκε τοὺς Σπαρτιάτας ἐπειδὴ πρότερον οἱ Ἀχαιοὶ τὴν Σπάρτην ᾤκουν. The legend of Castor belonged to times before the Heraclidae.—**ὑψίπεδον** is ἅπαξ εἰρημένον, cp. ὑψίβατοι πόλιες (*Nem.* X. 47) of the cities in Achaia. The epithet is highly appropriate to Therapna, situated on the steep heights south-east of Sparta. Pindar probably knew the place, unlike the scholiasts who were much puzzled by the epithet. Schol. (p. 367) τὸ δὲ ὑψίπεδον ἕδος δοκεῖ ἐναντίως εἰρῆσθαι τῷ Ὁμηρικῷ. φησὶ γὰρ [δ 1]
οἱ δ' ἶξον κοίλην Λακεδαίμονα κητώεσσαν.
ἀλλ' ἀπολυσόμεθα οὕτως· ὑψίπεδος ἡ Λακεδαίμων καθ' ἑαυτήν, κοίλη δὲ ὡς πρὸς τὰς πλησίον πόλεις.—For Castor at Therapna, compare *Nem.* X. 56 ἐν γυάλοις Θεράπνας.—**Τυνδαρίδας** is pointed, in the neighbourhood of Ἰφικλέος παῖς. For Castor was son of Tyndareus, while his twin brother Polydeuces was son of Zeus; even as Iphicles came of the seed of Amphitryon, while Zeus begat Heracles.

32. **χαίρετ'** κ.τ.λ.] *Rejoice, Castor and Iolaus. I pass from you—arraying a song for Poseidon and most holy Isthmus and the shores of Onchestus,—to tell, amid the honours of this man* (Herodotus), *how high and noble was the omen of his father Asopodorus, and to celebrate his country, the glebe of Orchomenus.*

**ἐγὼ δέ** marks the transition from the heroes to Asopodorus just as in the first epode **ἀλλ' ἐγώ** (l. 14) marked the passage from the prelude to Herodotus.—In view of the hiatus before Ἰσθμοῦ in

Ὀγχηστίαισίν τ' αἰόνεσσιν περιστέλλων ἀοιδὰν
γαρύσομαι τοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἐν τιμαῖσιν ἀγακλέα τὰν Ἀσωποδώρου
πατρὸς αἶσαν

Ὀρχομενοῖό τε πατρῴαν ἄρουραν, στρ. γ'. 35
ἅ νιν ἐρειδόμενον ναυαγίαις

l. 9 above I do not venture to follow Mingarelli in reading Ποσειδάωνί τ'.—**ζαθέᾳ**, generally used of places sanctified by temples.

33. **Ὀγχηστίαισιν**] Onchestus in Boeotia, near lake Copais, was celebrated for its temple of Poseidon: compare B 506

Ὀγχηστόν θ' ἱερόν, Ποσιδήϊον· ἀγλαὸν ἄλσος.

For the association of the Poseidon-worship on the Isthmus and at Onchestus, see *Isth.* III. B 19, 20.—**αἰόνεσσι**: not elsewhere in Pindar. Schol.: αἰόνεσσι δὲ εἶπεν ἐπειδὴ παράκειται τῇ Ὀγχηστῷ πόλει τῆς Βοιωτίας ἡ Κωπαῒς λίμνη.

**περιστέλλων**] This verb is found twice in Pindar (here and *Nem.* XI. 15), in both places implying a metaphor from dress. The scholiast interprets θεραπεύων τὸν ὕμνον, τουτέστιν ἐπιμελείας καὶ σπουδῆς ἀξιῶν. Cp. *Philoctetes* 447 ἀλλ' εὖ περιστέλλουσιν αὐτὰ δαίμονες, *the gods cherish them*. The poet spends care on the attiring of his Song.

34. **γαρύσομαι**] For γαρύω *to celebrate* cp. *Ol.* XIII. 50. The middle of this verb is not found elsewhere in Pindar.—**ἀγακλέα** (also in *Pyth.* IX. 106 ἀγακλέα κούραν) is predicate: *I will praise as distinguished.*—**αἶσα** here has the sense of omen (compare my note on *Nem.* III. 16) and alludes to the name Ἀ-σωπό-δωρος, implying *silence;* see below, l. 63 **σεσωπαμένον**, and above, *Introduction*, p. 6, where the reasons for this interpretation are set forth.

35. **ἄρουραν**] Cp. ἄρουραν πατρίαν, *Ol.* II. 14.—Schol. προείρηται ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν Θηβαῖος ὁ δὲ πατὴρ Ὀρχομένιος. § ἢ οἱ μὲν τοῦ πατρὸς γονεῖς Ὀρχομένιοι ὁ δὲ πατὴρ Θηβαῖος διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖ γεννηθῆναι.—Mezger explains πατρῴαν ἄρουραν as hereditary landed property of Asopodorus (*Erbbesitz*); but he does not tell us how to combine this meaning with the genitive Ὀρχομενοῖο.

36. **ἅ νιν ἐρειδόμενον** κ.τ.λ.] There are two questions here which call for discussion. (1) Is the shipwreck literal or figurative? (2) What is the meaning of ἐρειδόμενον?

(1) Didymus and the scholiasts regarded ναυαγίαις as metaphorical. Schol. (Abel p. 369) ἀλληγορεῖ δὲ τὴν ἔκπτωσιν θαλάσσῃ καὶ χειμῶνι παραβάλλων, and again καὶ Αἰσχύλος τὴν δυστυχίαν χειμῶνα καὶ τρικυμίαν λέγει. § συντυχίᾳ, τῇ φυγῇ. One note however (p. 368): ἄλλως· ναυαγήσας ὁ Ἀσωπόδωρος ἐν Ὀρχομενῷ ἐξερρίφη, furnishes an indication that some favoured a literal interpretation. Most modern editors, including Mr Fennell, adopt the metaphorical explanation, with the exception of Mezger who holds that Asopodorus had lost his fortune by a shipwreck in the most literal sense. With all deference to the general unanimity of critics, I do not hesitate to follow the dissentient view of Mezger. It is important to observe that there is not the least hint in Pindar's words that he alludes to political troubles or that there is any metaphorical significance in his language. This being so it is unnecessary and unwarranted to press upon the sentence a meaning which it does not literally bear. And ἐξ ἀμετρήτας ἁλός would be infelicitous in a political metaphor. The natural sense is that Asopodorus, reduced to poverty by the wreck of ships in which he had ventured his wealth, retired from Thebes to Orcho-

ἐξ ἀμετρήτας ἁλὸς ἐν κρυοέσσᾳ
δέξατο συντυχίᾳ·
νῦν δ' αὖτις ἀρχαίας ἐπέβασε πότμος
συγγενὴς εὐαμερίας. ὁ πονήσαις δὲ νόῳ καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει. 40

εἰ δ' ἀρεταῖς ἀνάκειται πᾶσαν ὀργάν, ἀντ. γ΄.

menus (his birthplace or at least the home of his fathers) and there recruited his fortunes.

In another sense however the words may be metaphorical, but, if so, it is a metaphor felicitous and transparent. The wreck of the man's fortune is spoken of as if he had been wrecked himself. It would be rash to conclude from νιν ἐρειδόμενον that Asopodorus must have been on board the unlucky vessel. That this form of expression may be only figurative is suggested by l. 39, **ἀρχαίας ἐπέβασε εὐαμερίας** (a phrase of which editors have missed the point) *set him on board the ship of his old prosperity*.

(2) Holding with the minority of commentators that ναυαγίαις is literally meant, we cannot hesitate to hold with the majority that ἐρειδόμενον means *hard pressed* (Dissen, *afflictum*, rather *cum affligeretur*). If we adopted the metaphorical view we might be disposed to entertain Donaldson's explanation *driven ashore* (rather, *hurled ashore*). For ἐρείδω *premere*, cp. *Ol.* IX. 30,

ἀνίκ' ἀμφὶ Πύλον σταθεὶς ἤρειδε Ποσειδᾶν,
ἤρειδεν δέ νιν ἀργυρέῳ τόξῳ πελεμίζων
Φοῖβος.

Hartung and Christ read ἐρειπόμενον. For **ναυαγίαις** Bergk accepts Schmid's ναυαγίοις.

37. **ἀμετρήτας**] Only here in Pindar (observe the feminine termination); in the Odyssey an epithet of πόνος and πένθος; but in Aristophanes, *Clouds* 264, of ἀήρ. The 'unmeasured sea' clearly means (as Mezger saw) the sea beyond the straits of Gadira, the *Weltmeer*, the Atlantic. The Mediterranean had well-known limits and ἀμέτρητος would be a most unsuitable epithet for the sea east of the Pillars. There is an interesting and close parallel in the first choral ode of the *Oedipus Rex* where Ares the god of death is sent in wish to 'the great deep of Amphitrite' or to the Euxine. θάλαμον Ἀμφιτρίτας alone would mean the sea, but μέγαν, as Professor Jebb says, 'helps to localise it' (cp. his note). ἀμετρήτας here plays the same part as μέγαν there. The antepenult is short here; Pindar has usually μέτρον but twice μέτρον.—**κρυοέσσᾳ**, *chilling*, occurs also in *Pyth.* IV. 73 κρυόεν μάντευμα. In Homer (where the form ὀκρυόεις is also found) it is an epithet of φόβος and πόλεμος, in Hesiod of πόλεμος. Cp. Aesch., *S. c. Th.* 834 κακόν με καρδίαν τι περιπίτνει κρύος.—**συντυχίᾳ**, here of ill luck; in *Pyth.* I. 36 of a fortunate event.

39. **ἐπέβασε**] For metaphor see above note on l. 36.—**πότμος**, cp. *Nem.* V. 40

πότμος δὲ κρίνει συγγενὴς ἔργων περὶ πάντων.

Pindar has πότμος six times, πότμος eight times.

40. **εὐαμερίας**] not elsewhere in Pindar. Its literal meaning *good weather* renders it specially appropriate here, coming after a storm.—**ὁ πονήσαις** κ.τ.λ. *But he who has suffered troubles gains for his soul prudence to balance them* (καί).—This is the doctrine taught in the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus; μάθος comes by πάθος. The scholiast quotes Alcman (*fr.* 63) πεῖρά τοι μαθήσιος ἀρχά, and Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 218 παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω.

41. **εἰ δ' ἀρεταῖς** κ.τ.λ.] B has ἀρεταῖ (and ἀρεταὶ) κατάκειται, D ἀρετᾷ κατάκειται. Aristarchus read ἀρετᾷ (schol. Ἀρίσταρχος σὺν τῷ ῑ γράφει καὶ περισπᾷ),

*ἀμφότερον δαπάναις τε καὶ πόνοις,*
*χρή νιν εὑρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον*

others ἀρεταί explaining the construction as the *schema Pindaricum* (schol. ὅτι ἀρεταὶ κατάκειται εἴρηκεν, ἐπιζεύξας πληθυντικῷ ἑνικὸν ῥῆμα τὸ κατάκειται). Modern editors either accept ἀρετᾷ or emend the passage; none have ventured to read ἀρεταί, which is indefensible both in point of syntax and in point of sense (though Hermann reads ἀρετά, explaining *si cui summo studio parata virtus est*).—Those who accept ἀρετᾷ from D and Aristarchus explain κατάκειται as *incumbit*, 'expends his efforts on' (=ἔγκειται). But there is no other instance of κατάκειμαι in such a sense, 'the nearest parallel' that Mr Fennell can adduce being Xenophon, *de Ven.* x. 8 εἰς τοῦτον τὴν ὀργὴν κατέθετο. Of the various emendations which have been put forward Kayser's ἀρετὰ κατάκειται πᾶσιν ὀργᾶν may seem to involve least change, but it gives a weak and I think inappropriate sense ('if virtue is proposed as a prize for all to desire'). Such wild changes as Hartung's καταθῇ τις, Rauchenstein's προσέχει τις, need not be seriously considered.

It is clear that the verse suffered corruption at an early stage, as its explanation puzzled critics in the days of Aristarchus. I believe that Bergk hit upon the original words of Pindar when he proposed **ἀρεταῖς ἀνάκειται**, but he did not perceive how the corruption came in. The tendency to confuse ΙС with Κ in uncial MSS. explains it. We can conceive how easily

ΑΡΕΤΑΙСΑΝΑΚΕΙΤΑΙ

might have been read ΑΡΕΤΑΚΑΝΑΚΕΙΤΑΙ (i.e. κἀνάκειται), and κατάκειται was an inevitable correction.—**ἀνάκειται** means *is devoted* or *dedicated*, **ἀρεταῖς** *to deeds of excellence*, and **πᾶσαν ὀργάν** defines the kind of dedication; *in every desire of his soul, in all his temper*, he is devoted to the service of ἀρεταί. The subject of ἀνάκειται is ὁ πονήσαις (not Asopodorus). The metaphor, from a votive statue, is perhaps suggested again in l. 46.—For **ὀργάν** cp. *Nem.* v. 32, *Pyth.* I. 89 εὐανθεῖ δ' ἐν ὀργᾷ, and *Isth.* v. 14 (see note).

42. **ἀμφότερον**] *in both ways*, cp. *Ol.* VI. 17 ἀμφότερον μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάρνασθαι. So plural, ἀμφότερα, *Ol.* I. 104.—**πόνοις** takes up **πονήσαις** l. 40.

43. **χρή νιν** κ.τ.λ.] *It is meet for men, if they have discovered a magnificent fashion of praise, to bear him up thereon with no ungenerous sentiments.* There are two views as to the construction of this sentence. (1) **νιν** is the object of εὑρόντεσσιν and refers to ἀρεταῖς (or ἀρετᾷ if ἀρετᾷ is retained), and ἀγάνορα κόμπον is the object of φέρειν. 'It is meet to bear praise to those who have won excellence' (compare πὺξ ἀρετὰν εὑρόντα *Ol.* VII. 89). According to this view the singular subject of the protasis (ὁ πονήσαις) becomes plural (εὑρόντεσσιν) in the apodosis. This interpretation of Dissen (who reads ἀρετᾷ κατάκειται) is adopted by Bergk in explaining ἀρεταῖς ἀνάκειται. For **νιν** plural in Pindar cp. *frag.* 7 ἔτι καὶ ἡ νιν τάσσεται ἐπὶ πλήθους· ὅστις δὴ τρόπος ἐξεκύλισέ νιν. (2) According to Mezger, νιν is the object of φέρειν and ἀγανορα κόμπον is the object of εὑρόντεσσιν. The syntax is: χρὴ εὑρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον φέρειν νιν. The construction of χρή with the dative is not found elsewhere in Pindar, but it is frequent in tragedy. It is to be observed that Didymus explained the words εὑρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον in the same way; βέλτιον δέ φησιν ὁ Δίδυμος τὸ εὑρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπαινούντων τοὺς νενικηκότας ἀκούειν, ἵν' ᾖ· προσήκει τοῖς εὑρόντεσσι τὸν ἀγάνορα κόμπον, τουτέστι τὸν ὕμνον εἰς τοὺς δαπάνῃ καὶ ἔργῳ κεκτημένους τὴν ἀρετὴν μὴ φθονεῖν. For **φέρειν μὴ φθονεραῖσι γνώμαις** cp. *Isth.* III. A 8 χρὴ δὲ κωμάζοντ' ἀγαναῖς χαρίτεσσιν βαστάσαι.

That Mezger's interpretation is right,

*μὴ φθονεραῖσι φέρειν*
*γνώμαις. ἐπεὶ κούφα δόσις ἀνδρὶ σοφῷ* 45
*ἀντὶ μόχθων παντοδαπῶν ἔπος εἰπόντ' ἀγαθὸν ξυνὸν ὀρθῶσαι καλόν.*

*ἐπ. γ'.*

*μισθὸς γὰρ ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐφ' ἔργμασιν ἀνθρώποις γλυκύς,*

there seems little doubt. It is hard to believe that *νιν* represents anything else than the subject of *ἀνάκειται*, and *εὑρόντεσσιν ἀγάνορα κόμπον* are most naturally taken together (as the metre suggests). The meaning too is much more satisfactory than that obtained by Dissen's construction; for there is no point here in an opposition between (*κατακεῖσθαι* or) *ἀνακεῖσθαι ἀρετᾷ* and *εὑρεῖν ἀρετάν*. Once more, *γνώμαις* has a forcible instrumental sense with *φέρειν* = *βαστάζειν*, whereas it is weak with *φέρειν* = *διδόναι*. The only objection that can be urged against Mezger is the circumstance that *χρή* with the dative is not elsewhere used by Pindar. But this may be merely accidental, and we must remember that *χρή* with accusative and infinitive is only found six times in his extant odes. Moreover in the present passage (where he might easily have written *χρή νιν ἐξευρόντας*) the dative renders the construction unambiguous (*pace* Dissen) and shews that *νιν* is object not subject of *φέρειν*. It may be added that the idea here expressed by *νιν φέρειν* recurs more emphatically and strikingly in l. 64 *εἴη νιν πτερύγεσσιν ἀερθέντ' ἀγλααῖς* κ.τ.λ.

**ἀγάνορα**] With *πλοῦτος* *Pyth.* X. 18, with *μισθός* *Pyth.* III. 55.—**κόμπον**, *Nem.* VIII. 49; *Isth.* IV. 24, where the sentiment and language are curiously similar, though there is another metaphor:

*μὴ φθόνει κόμπον τὸν ἐοικότ' ἀοιδᾷ*
*κιρνάμεν ἀντὶ πόνων.*

44. **μὴ φθονεραῖσι γνώμαις**] Compare *Nem.* IV. 39:

*φθονερὰ δ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ βλέπων*
*γνώμαν κενεὰν σκότῳ κυλίνδει*
*χαμαὶ πετοῖσαν.*

45. **κούφα δόσις**] predicate; the subject is (*τὸ*), *ἔπος εἰπόντα ἀγαθὸν, ξυνὸν καλὸν ὀρθῶσαι*.—**ἀνδρὶ σοφῷ**, *man of poetical skill.*

46. **παντοδαπῶν**] This word occurs in the literal sense in *Ol.* VIII. 26 *παντοδαποῖσιν ξένοις*, *strangers of all lands; frag.* 88 *παντοδαπῶν ἀνέμων winds from diverse homes.* In *Pyth.* III. 7 *νούσων παντοδαπῶν*, *maladies of all forms.*—**ξυνὸν ὀρθῶσαι καλόν**, *to exalt the glory of his country also.* In *Ol.* III. 3, we have *ὕμνον ὀρθώσαις*, of *building a high hymn;* so *καλόν* here is *a fair monument*, and **ξυνόν** means *pertaining to the general as well as to individual* honour. For *ὀρθόω* cp. also *Isth.* III. B 38 *πᾶσαν ὀρθώσαις ἀρετάν* and V. 65.

47. **μισθὸς** κ.τ.λ.] *For the rewards which men win, to sweeten their toil, are divers for divers works, one for the grazer of sheep, another for the ploughman, for the birdsnarer one, and another for him whom ocean fostereth.*—This verse presents a good example of the tendency of scribes to omit one of two similar words. B has

*μισθὸς γὰρ ἄλλος ἐφ' ἔργμασιν,*

*ἄλλοις* being omitted owing to the close resemblance of the next word

ΑΛΛΟΙϹΑΛΛΟϹ.

Another scribe supplied the obvious missing word, but in the wrong place, at the expense of the metre; D has *ἄλλος ἄλλοις*. The Triclinian MSS. ε ζ have the right restoration. **ἐφ' ἔργμασιν** signals to *ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ ἔργματι* l. 27.

*μηλοβότᾳ τ' ἀρότᾳ τ' ὀρνιχολόχῳ τε καὶ ὃν πόντος τράφει·*
*γαστρὶ δὲ πᾶς τις ἀμύνων λιμὸν αἰανῆ τέταται.*
*ὃς δ' ἀμφ' ἀέθλοις ἢ πολεμίζων ἄρηται κῦδος ἁβρόν,* 50
*εὐαγορηθεὶς κέρδος ὕψιστον δέκεται, πολιατᾶν καὶ ξένων γλώσσας ἄωτον.*

*ἄμμι δ' ἔοικε Κρόνου σεισίχθον' υἱὸν* στρ. δ'.
*γείτον' ἀμειβομένοις εὐεργέταν*
*ἁρμάτων ἱπποδρόμιον κελαδῆσαι,*

48. **μηλοβότᾳ**] Also in Euripides, *Cyclops* 53. *μηλοβοτήρ* is in Homer, Σ 529. Pindar has *μηλόβοτος grazed on by sheep* in *Pyth.* XII. 2.—**ἀρότᾳ**, metaphorical in *Nem.* VI. 37.—**ὀρνιχολόχος** (=*ὀρνιθοθήρας*) perhaps coined by Pindar.—**ὃν πόντος τράφει**, the fisherman. Schol. *Χρύσιππος τὸν ἔμπορον, Δίδυμος δὲ τὸν ἁλιέα φησί.* *τράφω* a collateral form of *τρέφω*, as *τράχω* of *τρέχω*, *τάμνω* of *τέμνω*. Cp. *Isth.* VII. 44. *τράφει* is preserved here by B (*τρέφει* D).

49. **γαστρὶ δὲ** κ.τ.λ.] *Every man strains himself to the task of keeping importunate hunger from his belly.*—For **τέταται** cp. *Pyth.* X. 54 *ξυνᾶισι δ' ἀμφ' ἀρεταῖς τέταμαι.* Cp. also *ἵπποισι τάθη δρόμος*, Ψ 375. Schol. *ἐπίκειται τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ κάμνει*, and *τὸ δὲ τέταται ἀντὶ τοῦ σπεύδει.*—**αἰανῆ**, *importunam.* Here it has much the sense of *gnawing.* In *Pyth.* IV. 236 *κέντρον αἰανές* is *the merciless goad;* in *Pyth.* I. 83 *κόρος αἰανής* is *intolerable disdain*, cp. *Isth.* III. A 2. *αἰανὴς νόσος* in Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 479, is a *wearisome malady*, and *νυκτὸς αἰανῆς* (*vasty night*) in the same play l. 416 (from *αἰανός*; cp. Sophocles, *Ajax* 672) suggests the weary weight of a long night and a malign quality in Νύξ herself. *εἰς τὸν αἰανῆ χρόνον* suggests the *endless monotony of time.* It is a favourite word of Aeschylus.

50. **ὃς δ'** κ.τ.λ.] *But whosoever wins the luxury of honour in games or in war, the loftiest gain that can be his is speech of praise, the finest breath that the mouths of citizens and strangers can utter.*—Cp. *ἁβρὸν λόγον* *Nem.* VII. 31; see above, *Introduction*, p. 5. The phrase of Keats 'some rich anger' might be rendered by *ὀργὰ ἁβρά.* For *ἀμφ'* cp. *ἀμφὶ πόνοις* *Nem.* VIII. 42.

51. **εὐᾱγορηθεὶς**] *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον* (MSS. *εὖ ἀγορηθεὶς*, emended by Pauw); *having been spoken well of.* *εὐηγορία*, praise, is in Callimachus, *Λοετρὰ Παλλάδος* 139.—**ὕψιστον**, cp. *Pyth.* I. 100 *στέφανον ὕψιστον δέδεκται.*—**πολιᾱτᾶν**; elsewhere Pindar has the form *πολίτας.*—**γλώσσας ἄωτον**, *fine effluence of the tongue*, with a suggestion of *breath* (*ἄημι*): cp. the remarks in my *Nemean Odes*, *App.* A, note 2.

52. **ἄμμι δ'**] Thus Pindar passes to Herodotus, just as in l. 32 he passed with *ἐγὼ δέ* to Asopodorus.—*But for us it is seemly in requital for the good deeds of the earthquaking son of Cronus, our neighbour* (of Onchestus), *to sound his praise as sovran of steeds and races.* **σεισίχθων** is not found elsewhere in Pindar.—**γείτονα**, schol. *τὸν Θηβαῖον ὡς πρὸς τὸν Ὀγχηστόν.*—**ἀμειβομένοις** (agreeing with *ἄμμι*) = *remunerantibus.* The immediate proximity of *ἀμειβομένοις* and *εὐεργέταν* is pointed.—**εὐεργέτας** is only here, and in *Pyth.* V. 44 (of Apollo).—*ἵππιος* is common as an epithet of Poseidon. **ἱπποδρόμιος** (only here in Pindar) is elsewhere used with *μήν* as the name of the Boeotian month corresponding to Hecatombaeon. Mr Fennell is right in taking **ἱππο͂δρόμιον** as predicate with *κελαδῆσαι*, but *εὐεργέταν* is predicate too, and *ἁρμάτων* depends on *εὐεργέταν.*

καὶ σέθεν, Ἀμφιτρύων, 55
παῖδας προσειπεῖν, τὸν Μινύα τε μυχὸν
καὶ τὸ Δάματρος κλυτὸν ἄλσος Ἐλευσῖνα καὶ Εὔβοιαν ἐν
γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις·

Πρωτεσίλα, τὸ τεὸν δ' ἀνδρῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἀντ. δ'.
ἐν Φυλάκᾳ τέμενος συμβάλλομαι.
πάντα δ' ἐξειπεῖν, ὅσ' ἀγώνιος Ἑρμᾶς 60
Ἡροδότῳ ἔπορεν
ἵπποις, ἀφαιρεῖται βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχων

55. **σέθεν ... παῖδας**] Heracles and Iolaus (cp. l. 30), a mode of speech which the schol. describes as *καταχρηστικῶς καὶ κατὰ σύλληψιν*. A victory won at the Heraclea or Iolaea, games at Thebes, is referred to.

56. **τὸν Μινύα τε μυχόν**] *The retiring valley of Minyas.* This refers to Minyea at Orchomenus. 'Winding vales' are *πολύγναμπτοι μυχοί* (*Ol.* III. 27).

57. **Ἐλευσῖνα**] Schol. *ὅτι ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι Δήμητρός ἐστιν ἀγών, καὶ στέφανος ἦν κριθαί.*

**Εὔβοιαν**] Schol. *Χρύσιππος· ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ ἄγεται τῷ Ἅιδῃ τὰ Βασίλεια.* Cp. *Ol.* XIII. 112 *ἅ τ' Ἐλευσὶς...ἅ τ' Εὔβοια.*

**ἐν γναμπτοῖς δρόμοις**] *in the matter of bending racecourses; wenn wir nämlich mit den Rennbahnen beschäftigt sind* (Mezger). The words are to be taken closely with *κελαδῆσαι καὶ προσειπεῖν*. They are set at the end of the sentence emphatically, that **δρόμοις** may signal to **δρόμοις** in l. 23.—**γναμπτός** is an epithet of *ἄγκιστρον*, *a fish hook*, in the Odyssey, δ 369. The shape of the *δίαυλος* resembled that of a hook. Cp. *Ol.* III. 33 *δωδεκάγναμπτον περὶ τέρμα δρόμου* (the *τέρμα* was to be 'turned' twelve times).

58. **Πρωτεσίλα** *κ.τ.λ.*] *I add to the tale thy precinct, Protesilaus, belonging to Achaians at Phylace.*—Phylace was a town on the Pagasaic Gulf. Schol.: *τελεῖται δὲ τῷ Πρωτεσιλάῳ κατὰ τὴν Φυλάκην ἐπιτάφιος ἀγών.*

59. **συμβάλλομαι**] Schol. *συγκαταριθμοῦμαι ταῖς τοῦ Ἡροδότου νίκαις.* The idea is that of adding as a contribution to a sum—here the *six* victories (mentioned above in l. 11) gained at (1) Isthmus, (2) Thebes, (3) Orchomenus, (4) Eleusis, (5) in Euboea, and (6) at Phylace. It does not seem certain that the schol. is right in attributing all these victories to Herodotus. Cp. above l. 11.—The middle of *συμβάλλω* does not occur elsewhere in Pindar, and the active only in *Nem.* XI. 33 (=*conjecture*).

60. **πάντα** *κ.τ.λ.*] *But to tell all the sum of what Hermes, god of Games, granted to the steeds of Herodotus, is precluded by the brief measure of the hymn.*—For **ἀγώνιος** see *Ol.* X. 63, *Isth.* IV. 7. For Ἑρμᾶς, a god of games, cp. *Ol.* VI. 79 *Ἑρμᾶν ὃς ἀγῶνας ἔχει μοῖράν τ' ἀέθλων*, and *Pyth.* II. 10 *ὅ τ'* **ἐναγώνιος Ἑρμᾶς**, see also *Nem.* X. 53.—**ἐξειπεῖν** depends on *ἀφαιρεῖται* (lit. *takes away from me the power of telling*).

61. **ἔπορεν**] B *ἔμπορεν*.—For the hiatus after a dative termination cp. *Nem.* VI. 23 *Ἀγησιμάχῳ υἱέων*, *Ol.* III. 30 *Ὀρθωσίᾳ ἔγραψεν ἱεράν* (an instance which I should have quoted in support of my conjecture in *Nem.* X. 5 *πολλὰ δ' Αἰγύπτῳ Ἰώ*, where the hiatus is before a long syllable). The case in l. 16 above is not the same, as the hiatus there follows a thesis.

62. **ἔχων**] *The hymn having a short measure*, means strictly *the circumstance that the hymn has a brief compass*, or

ὕμνος. ἦ μὰν πολλάκι καὶ τὸ σεσωπαμένον εὐθυμίαν μείζω
φέρει.

εἴη νιν εὐφώνων πτερύγεσσιν ἀερθέντ' ἀγλααῖς ἐπ. δ'.
Πιερίδων ἔτι καὶ Πυθῶθεν Ὀλυμπιάδων τ' ἐξαιρέτοις 65
Ἀλφεοῦ ἔρνεσι φράξαι χεῖρα τιμὰν ἑπταπύλοις

most simply βραχὺ μέτρον ὕμνου.—**μέτρον**, cp. l. 37.

63. **ἦ μὰν** κ.τ.λ.] *True it is that often the thing hushed away bringeth even greater joyousness* (than the tale told).—ἦ μάν in Pindar occurs only here and *Pyth.* IV. 40.—An old unreduplicated form of σιωπάω (= σισωπάω) has been preserved (strange to say) by the MSS. here and in *Ol.* XIII. 91:

διασωπάσομαί οἱ μόρον ἐγώ,

where Triclinius 'restored' διασιγάσομαι (Hermann διασιωπάσομαι) just as here Hermann wished to read σεσιγαμένον and has found some to follow him. It was probably not without a purpose that Pindar chose this rare form; he wished to emphasize an etymology of the name of the victor's father Ἀ-σωπό-δωρος. See *Introduction*, p. 6.—The scholiasts record the view that Pindar alludes to a defeat experienced by Herodotus at Nemea. It is obvious that this is an invention because a Nemean is not in the list of victories. But they also record the right view that the other victories were (comparatively) ἀνάξιοι, and therefore better omitted.—**καί**, what is not spoken *as well as* what is spoken bringeth joy; and not only joy, but it may be *greater joy*.—**εὐθυμίαν** occurs in *Ol.* II. 38, where εὐθυμίαι are opposed to πόνοι, and in *frag.* 55, Εὐθυμίᾳ τε μέλων εἴην (*may I be a favourite of Euthymia*). A scholium strangely paraphrases μείζονα τὴν εὔκλειαν φέρει.—**φέρει** responds to **φέρει** in l. 40.

64, 65. **εἴη** κ.τ.λ.] *May it be, that he, raised up on the wings resplendent of the tuneful Pierides, may yet fence his hand with other* (**καί**) *leaves won from Pytho and choice leaves of Olympian games from the banks of Alpheus, and build up honour for seven-gated Thebes.*

For **εἴη** with accusative and infinitive to express a wish, cp. *Ol.* I. 115.—**εὔφωνος** occurs also in *Pyth.* I. 38, **πτέρυγες** in *Pyth.* I. 6.—**καί**, in addition to the crowns which he has already won. **τ'** connects Πυθῶθεν (MSS. Πυθόθεν), and Ὀλυμπιάδων; but while ἔρνεσι is to be taken with both, **ἐξαιρέτοις** belongs only to the leaves of Olympia. ἐξαίρετος occurs also in *Nem.* I. 70 and *Ol.* IX. 27.—**Ὀλυμπιάδων**, from the *substantive* Ὀλυμπιάς, *the Olympic agon*, cp. ἄνθε' Ὀλυμπιάδος *Nem.* VI. 63, also *Ol.* X. 58, I. 97 τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων. The olive-leaves pertain to the Olympian games and belong to Alpheus (Ἀλφεοῦ) because they grow on his banks.

66. **ἔρνεσι**] This word signals to **ἔρνεσιν** in l. 29. So in *Nem.* VI. ἔρνεα, l. 18 signals to ἔρνεσι, l. 37.—**φράξαι**. This verb (not elsewhere in Pindar's epinicians) is generally translated *implicare*. Mr Fennell, comparing the cognate Latin *farcio*, suggests that it means 'fill to the full'. But the ordinary signification of φράσσω is not out of place: *to fortify* or *secure*. (Cp. the schol. on III. B 54.) Herodotus might fortify his hands with wreaths of victory, as a warrior fortifies his body with armour or his hands with gauntlets. Yet, to justify such an unusual phrase, we might expect that Pindar meant to suggest something beneath the surface. And, if we observe that it is closely followed by another unusual expression τεύχοντα τιμάν, we may be inclined to believe that the ἔρνεα won by her children are regarded as a sort of armour (τεύχεα) for Thebes. **τεύχοντ'** is em-

Θήβαισι τεύχοντ'. εἰ δέ τις ἔνδον νέμει πλοῦτον κρυφαῖον,
ἄλλοισι δ' ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ, ψυχὰν Ἀίδᾳ τελέων οὐ φράζεται
δόξας ἄνευθεν.

phatic, for it signals to **τεύχω** in l. 14, and **χεῖρα** is emphatic likewise, for it responds punctually to **χερσί** in l. 15. The hands which held the reins are to be charged with wreaths. The unusual φράξαι serves to emphasize χεῖρα and make the responsion more patent.

67. **εἰ δέ τις** κ.τ.λ.] *But whoever dispenses hidden wealth at home, and laughs when he lights on men of another sort, considers not &c.*—**νέμειν πλοῦτον** means *to dispense wealth;* if a man is said νέμειν πλοῦτον **ἔνδον**, *to dispense wealth at home*, that is equivalent to saying that he does not dispense it at all. ἔνδον is emphatic. Missing the point of the phrase, commentators have tried to force νέμειν into meaning *fovere*.—**κρυφαῖον**, only here in Pindar, who has elsewhere κρύφιος. He has both κρύφα and κρυφᾷ as the adverb.

**νέμει** signals to **νωμάσαντ'** l. 15; see *Introduction*.

68. **ἄλλοισι**] *Others* in a 'pregnant' sense, men different from himself, those namely who use their wealth (like Asopodorus and Herodotus) for noble purposes; cp. δαπάναις l. 42.—**ἐμπίπτων γελᾷ**. (1) The scholiast explains ἐπεμβαίνων καταγελᾷ, *insults and ridicules*, to which Dissen objects that Pindar would have written ἐμπίπτει γελῶν, if such was his meaning. (2) Dissen explains *insultans ridet, sibi placet insultans*, 'takes pleasure in insulting'. Mr Fennell and Mezger adopt the explanation of the scholiast.

(3) We may hesitate to accept either interpretation. I can find no other example of ἐμπίπτω meaning verbal insult. When this verb means *attack*, it implies physical violence. (For example it is a *vox propria* for disease, cp. Thucydides, II. 49 λύγξ τοῖς πλείοσιν ἐνέπιπτε κενή, Soph. *Trach.* 1253 πρὶν ἐμπεσεῖν σπαραγμόν, *Phil.* 699.) In any case, the other signification of ἐμπίπτω, *light upon, fall in with*, is quite adequate to the occasion. When the hoarder falls in with 'other men' (far other indeed than he) he laughs at the thought of their folly and his own superior wisdom.—Mr Tyrrell suggests that ἄλλοισι might be taken as neuter, κτήμασι being supplied from πλοῦτον; then the meaning would be 'as he pounces on more'; cp. ὃς ἐν κτήμασι πίπτεις, Soph. *Ant.* 782.—**τελέων**, present, not future (which in Pindar is τελέσω). The present includes the future and is more telling than a future tense would be; for the man's conduct is continuous, and death, which may come at any moment, must always find him δόξας ἄνευθεν. *He considers not that he is without glory,—whenever he has to render his soul to Hades.* But the expression is still more speaking if it be recognized that τελέων suggests further the notion of initiation: *he considers not that Glory is absent from the initiation of his soul for Hades;* the experience of life being a sort of mystery.—**ἄλλοισι** signals to ἀλλοτρίαις l. 15 and ἄλλοις ἄλλος l. 47.

# ISTHMIAN II.

## ODE IN HONOUR OF A VICTORY IN THE CHARIOT-RACE AT ISTHMUS WON BY XENOCRATES OF ACRAGAS.

### INTRODUCTION.

FROM this hymn, written soon after the death of Xenocrates of Acragas, the first impression that one gets is of a strong sweetness scattered in the air; meant, one might think, to overcome some bitter breath, lingering around Thrasybulus, the son of Xenocrates[1], to whom this 'Song with a soft voice' is sent. Pindar has here tempered his voice to softness; he has mixed, as it were, a vessel of musical honey, to be offered to the dead. For us, there are some peculiar difficulties about the ode, though its general framework is simple enough. It falls into three parts. In the first, a contrast is drawn between poets past and present. In the second, the victories, won at Panhellenic games by Xenocrates and his house, are rehearsed. In the third, a picture is drawn of the personal character of Xenocrates.

The chief difficulties which call for discussion are two. There is a difficulty about the date of the ode; and there is a difficulty about its interpretation. The first question is the less important, and one might be content with sparing it a note or an appendix, if one did not find that the second question soon leads to the same places of investigation. The difficulty in interpretation is to discover the connexion of the first eleven verses of the hymn with the rest.

The argument of these verses may be summed thus: 'The poets of former days used lightly, and without any mercenary bargain, to sing in praise of beautiful boys; the Muse was not then a hirewoman; she did not sell her

[1] The scholiast is not certain whether Thrasybulus was the son of Xenocrates or not (Abel, p. 379 ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος ἀδελφὸν ὑπείληφε τοῦ Ξενοκράτους εἶναι τὸν Θρασύβουλον, ἔνιοι δὲ υἱὸν Ξενοκράτους). But Pindar leaves us in no doubt: cp. *Pyth.* VI. 15 πατρὶ τεῷ, Θρασύβουλε, and *Isth.* II. 44 which is clear enough.—Some actually thought that Thrasybulus was the father of Xenocrates (Abel, p. 380).

songs for silver. But now it is different, and the old saying "Money makes the man" is as true in the world of poetry as elsewhere.'

Why should all this be said to Thrasybulus? What has the comparison of ancient and modern poets to do with the victories of the Emmenids or with the poem in which Pindar celebrates them[1]?

It is clear that this comparison must be closely connected with the subject of the ode or have an application to the circumstances under which it was composed, for otherwise it would be little better than nonsense. Thrasybulus is emphatically addressed in the first verse of the hymn; and we cannot doubt that the following reflexions conveyed some meaning which specially concerned him, and which he easily understood.

It is also to be observed that Pindar accentuates the dedication of songs to comely boys, as characteristic of the men of old (οἱ πάλαι φῶτες). But in order to advance further we must study the earlier relations of Pindar with the house of Xenocrates.

Xenocrates belonged to the noble Acragantine family of the Emmenids and was brother of the despot Theron. He and Theron are linked together by Pindar as the 'sons of Aenesidamus'[2]. In the 24th Pythiad, that is, in 494 B.C., the horse of Xenocrates won in the chariot race at the Pythian games[3], and the victory was celebrated by Simonides[4]. But it was also celebrated by Pindar, and luckily the ode which he composed for the occasion has come down to us as the Sixth Pythian; which, in the chronological list of his extant works, should possibly stand second (after the Tenth Pythian which is the earliest of all). It certainly strikes one as strange that Xenocrates should have paid two poets to celebrate the same victory. It was natural that he should choose, for this office, Simonides, already a man of years and

[1] The scholiasts thought that the 'Introduction' (προοίμιον) was a gentle hint to Thrasybulus that Pindar wanted to be paid; (Abel, p. 381) ἐξειργάσατο δὲ τὸ προοίμιον ὁ Πίνδαρος πάλιν ἑαυτῷ τῆς τοῦ ἐπινίκου γραφῆς μισθὸν πορίζόμενος, and in reference to l. 12 (p. 385) φανερὸν γὰρ ὡς μισθὸν αἰτῶν τὸν Θρασύβουλον τό τε ἀπόφθεγμα προήνεγκε τὸ περὶ τῶν χρημάτων καὶ προσεπιλέγει· οὐκ ἀγνῶτ' ἀείδω. But they also thought that ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα was aimed at the greed of Simonides. Such a weapon would have been indeed double-edged. Socrates might make allusions to the circumstance that Protagoras taught for fees; but such a taunt would come ill from Hippias or Prodicus.

[2] *v.* 28, and *Ol.* II. 49. Yet Artemon, who made a special study of Sicilian history, thought that Xenocrates was only a kinsman (μόνον συγγενῆ) of Theron (Abel, p. 379). For the Emmenid family see *Pyth.* VI. 5.

[3] The date is given in the scholia on the authority of Aristotle: ἀλλὰ καὶ Πύθια τὴν κδ' Πυθιάδα ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης ἀναγράφει (Abel, p. 379). See Aristotle *frag.* 574, ed. Rose.

[4] Schol. Abel *ib.*, where we learn that both the Pythian and Isthmian victories were sung by Simonides. καὶ Σιμωνίδης δὲ ἐπαινῶν αὐτὸν ἀμφοτέρας αὐτοῦ τὰς νίκας κατατάσσει. In the schol. on *Ol.* II. 49 (κατὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους Πυθιονίκης μόνος Θήρων ἀναγέγραπται) it seems clear (as Boeckh points out) that Θήρων is a mistake for Ξενοκράτης.

at the height of his fame, but it was not so much a matter of course that he should choose Pindar, who was yet very young and could hardly have attained so soon the world-wide renown of his older rival.

The Sixth Pythian is in some ways a remarkable poem. It is addressed not to the victor Xenocrates but to his son Thrasybulus; and it gives the impression that it is not quite an official ode of victory. One is tempted to suspect that the 'ordinary' epinician was that written by Simonides; and that the ode of Pindar which has survived was 'extraordinary'. And the meaning of the argument of the hymn has always seemed strangely enigmatic. Thrasybulus is praised for some act of filial piety, which is illustrated by the famous deed of Antilochus who lost his own life in saving Nestor[1]. It is generally assumed that the remarkable piety of Thrasybulus consisted in driving his father's chariot at the Pythian games. Some words in the hymn have been taken to imply that he did so; but it may be shewn that such a sense cannot fairly be extracted from them, and there are other considerations which disprove this view (see *Appendix* B).

The one thing that we know about the tastes of Thrasybulus, though not indeed incompatible with such excellence in guiding steeds as a successful charioteer must have possessed, is certainly not what we should expect to find in a compeer of Nicomachus and Phintis. Thrasybulus was devoted to the Muses: his skill in poetry is mentioned in both the odes which are addressed to him.

*Pyth.* VI. 49: σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων (δρέπει).
*Isth.* II. 12: ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὢν σοφός.

σοφία means, as constantly in Pindar, mastery of the technical rules of poetry and music, which were then closely combined.

It is this fact about Thrasybulus, I believe, that furnishes the clew to the enigma. If we suppose that the piety of the young man stimulated him to apply his poetic craft to the praises of his father's victory, the hymn of Pindar appears in a new light. The typical example of filial piety was Antilochus; but the great act by which that hero displayed his dutiful affection was very different in kind from the less exacting proof given by Thrasybulus. We might therefore have expected that the poet would merely suggest a general likeness with the son of Nestor, and not record the details of the special incident. But the superficial circumstance that the same material object was connected with both acts of filial piety was tempting. The chariot of Nestor is set beside the chariot of Xenocrates (ll. 32 and 17). And Pindar reinforces the accidental point of likeness by another but artificial similitude. He has declared (l. 6 sqq.) that Xenocrates, by his victory, has set up a treasure house for himself and Acragas in the glen of Apollo; a treasure house of hymns, which neither the wind nor the 'cruel battle of the loud thundering cloud'

ἐριβρόμου νεφέλας στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος

[1] Mr Gildersleeve (Introduction to *Pyth.* VI.) thinks that 'the step from Antilochus to Thrasybulus is too great for sober art'.

shall ever sweep away. If the chief treasure meant in this treasure house of hymns is, as I suppose, a song composed by Thrasybulus, the vocative case in the next sentence is pertinent and pointed:

> φάει δὲ πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ
> πατρὶ τεῷ, Θρασύβουλε, κοινάν τε γενεᾷ
> λόγοισι θνατῶν
> εὔδοξον ἅρματι νίκαν
> Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς ἀπαγγελεῖ.

The song which Thrasybulus built up under a pious inspiration may, unlike a material edifice, defy wind and rain; and even so Antilochus, bent on his pious task, feared not the stormy onslaught of the Ethiopian chief,

> ἀναμείναις στράταρχον Αἰθιόπων (l. 31)[1].

This parallel gives a new point to a word which has sometimes been suspected. The χειμέριος ὄμβρος in l. 10 is described as ἐπακτὸς ἐλθών, suggesting that 'the army of the cloud' came from a foreign land; and it may be observed that this expression would have been exactly appropriate to the Ethiopian ally of the Trojans.

But, it may be asked, why should Pindar have written an ode for the purpose of praising the poetic essays of a young Sicilian?

It was not a task that Xenocrates was likely to set him; it must have been a spontaneous tribute which he would hardly have paid to any save a personal friend. And the whole tone of the ode suggests that Pindar knew Thrasybulus and had been filled with an almost ardent admiration for him. He is not quite sure whether his hymn is an ode of victory or a song of love, as he says in the opening verses:

> ἀκούσατ', ἦ γὰρ ἑλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας
> ἄρουραν ἢ χαρίτων
> ἀναπολίζομεν.

In the last strophe he praises the mind and manners of Thrasybulus, who is like unto his father:

> νόῳ δὲ πλοῦτον, ἄγων
> ἄδικον οὔθ' ὑπέροπλον ἥβαν, δρέπει,
> σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων·
> τίν τ' Ἐλέλιχθον...
> μάλα Ϝαδόντι νόῳ προσέχεται·
> γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν
> καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν
> μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον.

One might infer from the last verses that Pindar had caroused in the company of Thrasybulus. As the Theban poet had not yet visited Sicily, we must suppose that Thrasybulus had visited elder Greece, where his

[1] Mezger noticed this signal; but attempted to explain it in accordance with the untenable view that Thrasybulus was his father's charioteer.

poetic tastes might easily have led him into communication with Pindar 'in the retreats of the Pierides'. It is only a guess, of course, but it is a probable one, that Thrasybulus was in Greece at the time of his father's victory, and witnessed those Pythian games. That Pindar was present too, there can be little doubt [1]; and though he does not call up the scene itself, he suggests the impression which it made on him in a few sounding words. He speaks of coming 'to the stone navel of loud-thundering earth,'

*ἐριβρόμου χθονός*

and the same adjective recurs, in a later verse:

*ἐριβρόμου νεφέλας*
*στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος.*

Again, having occasion to speak of Zeus, he emphasizes the attributes of thunder and lightning:

*βαρυόπαν στεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε πρύτανιν* (24).

It would seem that the sound of thunder was in the ears of the poet when after the festival he left the vale of Pytho, and *ἐρίβρομος* the word that came to his lips to describe the spectacle which he had witnessed. The deafening noise of the shouts of the onlookers, mixed with the rattling of the chariots in the terrible speed of the race, and echoed by the hills, might well have reminded Pindar of the roar of the storms which filled the valley in the inclement seasons of the year.

We must now pass on from the days when Pindar and Thrasybulus were young together, to a later period. The next Panhellenic victory that fell to the lot of an Emmenid of Acragas was also won by the horses of Xenocrates, this time at Isthmus.

The date of the Isthmian victory is not known. It may have been won in 476 B.C. or in an earlier year; but we know that it was not later. For in that year, a still greater victory was won by the brother of Xenocrates, by the tyrant of Acragas himself, in the chariot race at Olympia and was celebrated by Pindar in the Second and Third Olympian odes. In the Second Olympian, the victories of Xenocrates at Pytho and at Isthmus [2] are mentioned together (vv. 49, 50):

*Πυθῶνι δ' ὁμόκλαρον ἐς ἀδελφεὸν*
*'Ισθμοῖ τε κοιναὶ Χάριτες ἄνθεα τεθρίππων δυωδεκαδρόμων*
*ἄγαγον.*

[1] It was probably as much a matter of course for Pindar to be present at the great agonistic festivals, as it is now, in England, for sporting men to attend the St Leger and the Derby.

[2] Mr Freeman (*History of Sicily*, vol. II., Appendix, Note XXVI. p. 534) thinks that there were two Isthmian victories, that mentioned in *Ol.* II., and that celebrated in *Isth.* II. But if this were the case, the earlier one would have been inevitably mentioned in *Isth.* II. There is no reason why many years should not have separated the winning of the victory and Pindar's ode. Odes were sometimes composed for anniversaries; and Simonides may have written the ode for the immediate occasion.

As the Isthmian games were celebrated in spring, the success of Xenocrates might have been gained in the same year as the Olympian victory of Theron. But it might also have been gained much earlier. Pindar, in any case, was not called upon to celebrate it for the immediate occasion; Simonides, doubtless, again performed that office, for it is recorded that he wrote an ode on the subject. Xenocrates was also successful at Athens, where his chariot was driven by one Nicomachus; and that this victory was gained after 476 B.C., we may infer from the fact that it is not mentioned in the Second Olympian.

Meanwhile the days of the Emmenid dynasty were drawing to a close. Theron died in 472 B.C., and his son Thrasydaeus was expelled, after a short and stormy reign, in the same year. Xenocrates died too about this time, but there is no evidence which of the brothers survived the other. And we know not what became of Thrasybulus.

It was after the fall of the Emmenids or at least after the death of Theron as the whole tone of the ode shews[1], it was certainly after the death of Xenocrates, that Pindar wrote the Second Isthmian. In all probability he was then in Sicily at the court of Hieron, and had thus been not far away from Acragas when the house of the Emmenids fell.

The circumstances under which this Isthmian ode was written may be guessed. Xenocrates designed to celebrate in 472 B.C. the anniversary of the Isthmian victory which he had won at least four years previously; and he called upon Pindar to write an ode for the occasion. He also sent to Isthmus for a wreath of 'Dorian parsley',—or wild celery, if this plant indeed be the *σέλινον*,—to renew the memory of his old victory. But before the wreath arrived, before the ode was written, before the anniversary came round, Xenocrates and Theron, too, were gathered to their fathers. The wreath reached Thrasybulus, if it came at all; and to him the ode is addressed. There was thus a certain sadness in the circumstances, at which Pindar just hints: (v. 15)

*Δωρίων αὐτῷ στεφάνωμα κόμᾳ*
*πέμπεν ἀναδεῖσθαι σελίνων,*

where the emphatic pronoun and the imperfect tense are to be observed.

And thus the hymn, which was to have been specially adapted to the Isthmian celebration, came to be something less special, rather a general encomium of Xenocrates than an epinician proper, although it retains so much of its original motive as to place the Isthmian victory first in order. The poet is really thinking less of the triumph on the Isthmus than of that earlier day of triumph, when he saw the comely youth Thrasybulus flushed with victory amid the din of the chariots and the multitude. The song, which that day had inspired twenty-two years ago, comes back to his memory;

[1] So Mr Freeman (*ib.* p. 535): 'I certainly think that the whole tone of the ode shows that it was written a few years later, after the overthrow of the Emmenid dynasty, that is, not earlier than B.C. 472'; and he notices 'the absence of any such references as would be looked for in a poem addressed to one whose family was still in power'. Mezger takes the same view of the date.

the song sung when the Emmenids had a brilliant future, when Thrasybulus, little more than a boy, had life before him. Now Thrasybulus is at least forty years old; and the Emmenid house has fallen. It was indeed natural that echoes of the old song should haunt the dimmer corridors of the new song; just as memories of his youth might flit sadly through the brain of Thrasybulus, after the misfortune which must have so largely changed his life.

(*a*) In the Pythian hymn, Pindar had told how the son trod in the footsteps of the father and had noticed some of his manners and pursuits. In the Isthmian hymn, he describes the character of the father, and the two descriptions suggest each other in language as well as in sense:

*Isth.* II. 35, sqq.

ὅσον ὀργὰν
Ξεινοκράτης ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν
ἔσχεν· αἰδοῖος μὲν ἦν ἀστοῖς ὁμιλεῖν
ἱπποτροφίας τε νομίζων ἐν Πανελλάνων νόμῳ.

*Pyth.* VI. 50, sqq.

τίν τ' Ἐλέλιχθον, ὀργᾶς ὃς ἱππειᾶν ἐσόδων[1],
μάλα Ϝαδόντι νόῳ, Ποσειδᾶν, προσέχεται.
γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν
καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν
μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον.

(*b*) In both odes σοφία is ascribed to Thrasybulus:

*Isth.* II. 12,

ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὢν σοφός.

*Pyth.* VI. 49,

σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων.

In both places it clearly refers to poetic studies.

(*c*) Thrasybulus is bidden to celebrate his father's excellence,

*Isth.* II. 44,

μήτ' ἀρετάν ποτε σιγάτω πατρῴαν,

that excellence which was his own guide in his youth;

*Pyth.* VI. 45,

πατρῴαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα.

(*d*) In both odes the Pythian victory is called an ἀγλαΐα,

*Isth.* II. 18,

εἶδ' Ἀπόλλων νιν πόρε τ' ἀγλαΐαν.

*Pyth.* VI. 46,

πάτρῳ τ' ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαΐαν ἔδειξεν.

No single one of these echoes, taken alone, would mean anything, but all taken together may well mean something. There are yet others, which I

[1] Reading uncertain; I give that of Christ. MSS. ὀργαῖς πάσαις ὃς ἱππείαν ἔσοδον. There is no reason to suspect ὀργαῖς or ὀργᾷς.

shall point out presently, but I must first shew that Pindar not only echoes but alludes to the earlier hymn. And in this connexion we come back to the problem with which we started: what is the meaning of the introductory verses concerning the mercenary Muse?

In the light of what we have since learned the following explanation presents itself.

I have already noticed that in the Sixth Pythian something of the express character of an epinician is lacking. The official ode was doubtless written by Simonides; but did Xenocrates call upon Pindar too to celebrate the occasion? It is not necessary to suppose that he did so. Pindar was then a young man, he may not have had so many calls upon his time as in later years, and if his imagination was attracted by the personality of the young Acragantine, it is easy to suppose that he might have written the ode of his own accord, and presented it to Thrasybulus, for love and not for money. The circumstance that it is addressed to him and not to Xenocrates is then perfectly explained.

Twenty years later, when Xenocrates asked Pindar to celebrate the anniversary of his Isthmian victory, the matter was a business-bargain. The Pythian Ode had been a *παίδειος ὕμνος*. Like 'the men of old', Pindar had ascended the chariot of the Muses and lightly shot a honeyed song at the Sicilian boy, without thought of a reward. But when Xenocrates called upon him for a hymn, he was serving a mercenary Muse.

Thus l. 3 of our ode,

*ῥίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους*

is an allusion to the Sixth Pythian; and Pindar indicates by an echo that this general statement has a special reference to hymns received by Thrasybulus: l. 30 sqq.

*καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀγνῶτες ὑμὶν ἐντὶ δόμοι*
*οὔτε κώμων, ὦ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατῶν*
*οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν.*

The Sixth Pythian might have been called *κῶμος ἐρατός*. But the emphatic address to Thrasybulus here, as in l. 1

*οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θρασύβουλε, φῶτες,*

removes all doubt as to the reference intended. In the last lines of the ode, too, when the poet bids the son of Xenocrates not to 'hush *these hymns* in silence', one may understand the Pythian ode as well as the Isthmian.

And these last lines suggest another question. One might have expected that after the deaths of his father and uncle, amid the following troubles and confusion, Thrasybulus would have had little thought of celebrating the Isthmian victory. One might imagine that he would have been more likely to countermand the hymn which his father had commissioned Pindar to write. But if not, if he still wished for the hymn, then there was certainly little need for the exhortation not to 'hush these hymns in silence'.

My view is that, after the death of Xenocrates, all thought of the Isthmian

the song sung when the Emmenids had a brilliant future, when Thrasybulus, little more than a boy, had life before him. Now Thrasybulus is at least forty years old; and the Emmenid house has fallen. It was indeed natural that echoes of the old song should haunt the dimmer corridors of the new song; just as memories of his youth might flit sadly through the brain of Thrasybulus, after the misfortune which must have so largely changed his life.

(*a*) In the Pythian hymn, Pindar had told how the son trod in the footsteps of the father and had noticed some of his manners and pursuits. In the Isthmian hymn, he describes the character of the father, and the two descriptions suggest each other in language as well as in sense:

*Isth.* II. 35, sqq.

ὅσον ὀργὰν
Ξεινοκράτης ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν
ἔσχεν· αἰδοῖος μὲν ἦν ἀστοῖς ὁμιλεῖν
ἱπποτροφίας τε νομίζων ἐν Πανελλάνων νόμῳ.

*Pyth.* VI. 50, sqq.

τίν τ' Ἐλέλιχθον, ὀργᾶς ὃς ἱππειᾶν ἐσόδων[1],
μάλα Ϝαδόντι νόῳ, Ποσειδᾶν, προσέχεται.
γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν
καὶ συμπόταισιν ὁμιλεῖν
μελισσᾶν ἀμείβεται τρητὸν πόνον.

(*b*) In both odes *σοφία* is ascribed to Thrasybulus:

*Isth.* II. 12,

ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὢν σοφός.

*Pyth.* VI. 49,

σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων.

In both places it clearly refers to poetic studies.

(*c*) Thrasybulus is bidden to celebrate his father's excellence,

*Isth.* II. 44,

μήτ' ἀρετάν ποτε σιγάτω πατρῴαν,

that excellence which was his own guide in his youth;

*Pyth.* VI. 45,

πατρῴαν μάλιστα πρὸς στάθμαν ἔβα.

(*d*) In both odes the Pythian victory is called an ἀγλαΐα,

*Isth.* II. 18,

εἶδ' Ἀπόλλων νιν πόρε τ' ἀγλαΐαν.

*Pyth.* VI. 46,

πάτρῳ τ' ἐπερχόμενος ἀγλαΐαν ἔδειξεν.

No single one of these echoes, taken alone, would mean anything, but all taken together may well mean something. There are yet others, which I

[1] Reading uncertain; I give that of Christ. MSS. ὀργαῖς πάσαις ὃς ἱππείαν ἔσοδον. There is no reason to suspect ὀργαῖς or ὀργᾷς.

shall point out presently, but I must first shew that Pindar not only echoes but alludes to the earlier hymn. And in this connexion we come back to the problem with which we started: what is the meaning of the introductory verses concerning the mercenary Muse?

In the light of what we have since learned the following explanation presents itself.

I have already noticed that in the Sixth Pythian something of the express character of an epinician is lacking. The official ode was doubtless written by Simonides; but did Xenocrates call upon Pindar too to celebrate the occasion? It is not necessary to suppose that he did so. Pindar was then a young man, he may not have had so many calls upon his time as in later years, and if his imagination was attracted by the personality of the young Acragantine, it is easy to suppose that he might have written the ode of his own accord, and presented it to Thrasybulus, for love and not for money. The circumstance that it is addressed to him and not to Xenocrates is then perfectly explained.

Twenty years later, when Xenocrates asked Pindar to celebrate the anniversary of his Isthmian victory, the matter was a business-bargain. The Pythian Ode had been a *παίδειος ὕμνος*. Like 'the men of old', Pindar had ascended the chariot of the Muses and lightly shot a honeyed song at the Sicilian boy, without thought of a reward. But when Xenocrates called upon him for a hymn, he was serving a mercenary Muse.

Thus l. 3 of our ode,

*ῥίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους*

is an allusion to the Sixth Pythian; and Pindar indicates by an echo that this general statement has a special reference to hymns received by Thrasybulus: l. 30 sqq.

*καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀγνῶτες ὑμὶν ἐντὶ δόμοι*
*οὔτε κώμων, ὦ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατῶν*
*οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν.*

The Sixth Pythian might have been called *κῶμος ἐρατός*. But the emphatic address to Thrasybulus here, as in l. 1

*οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θρασύβουλε, φῶτες,*

removes all doubt as to the reference intended. In the last lines of the ode, too, when the poet bids the son of Xenocrates not to 'hush *these hymns* in silence', one may understand the Pythian ode as well as the Isthmian.

And these last lines suggest another question. One might have expected that after the deaths of his father and uncle, amid the following troubles and confusion, Thrasybulus would have had little thought of celebrating the Isthmian victory. One might imagine that he would have been more likely to countermand the hymn which his father had commissioned Pindar to write. But if not, if he still wished for the hymn, then there was certainly little need for the exhortation not to 'hush these hymns in silence'.

My view is that, after the death of Xenocrates, all thought of the Isthmian

celebration was given up, and that Pindar at a later date sent this 'Isthmian' hymn to Thrasybulus as a personal compliment, without seeking for payment, just as, under very different circumstances, he had sent the Pythian hymn more than twenty years before. Thrasybulus probably could not have afforded or would not have been disposed to pay the usual fee for an epinician ode. History does not record his fortunes after the fall of his house[1], but it seems likely that his property was confiscated and that he had to flee from Acragas, as was the usual fate of the kinsmen of fallen despots.

And now the first part of our hymn becomes intelligible. The 'wise' Thrasybulus, seeing between the lines, might have read as follows:

'You do not expect this ode, O Thrasybulus. But you cannot forget that, twenty years ago, inspired by a scene which also inspired you, a scene which you must still vividly remember, I wrought a song in your praise, seeking no hire for my work. You were a youth then, I was young too. Since then, my hymns have been indeed silvered; I have written for money, that is my trade. That the world is mercenary you may have discovered by recent experience; and I cannot except myself from that law. A man of Argos, when he lost his wealth and his friends deserted him, said bitter words which have passed into a proverb, "Money is the man". That is perfectly true. Your father asked me to write an epinician in memory of his Isthmian victory; and of course he would have paid me well and I should have expected him to do so. But a man of Acragas, when he has lost his wealth, can hardly afford the extravagance of an epinician: nor is he likely to get one for nothing. When wealth flies away, friends fly away too. But still,—for the sake of that disinterested παίδειος ὕμνος, which I made for you twenty years ago, when the prospect was brighter than now, accept, O Thrasybulus, as a gift from your mercenary friend, this, let us call it an Isthmian, hymn'.

Such, I suggest, was the import of the first twelve verses to the ears of Thrasybulus. And it is possible that the Pythian ode may have been recalled to his mind by two verbal echoes, which may now be added to those which I have collected above.

(*e*) The silvered *faces* of the songs
*Isth.* II. 8,

ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί,

may suggest the curious expression in *Pyth.* VI. 14, that the *face* or front of the treasure-house of hymns will announce the Pythian victory.

φάει δὲ πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ<br>πατρὶ τεῷ, Θρασύβουλε, ......<br>...... ἀπαγγελεῖ.

(*f*) The maxim emphasized in the Sixth Pythian was to honour

[1] See Mr Freeman, *History of Sicily*, II. p. 298.

parents,—a maxim gloriously followed by Thrasybulus. The command was given by Chiron to Achilles:

20 σύ τοι...ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν.

But now, twenty years after, it is a very different maxim that is brought most prominently before the notice of the exiled, or, at least, the fallen Emmenid:

*Isth.* II. 9,
νῦν δ' ἐφίητι τὸ τὠργείου φυλάξαι...
χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ.

This was the new experience of Thrasybulus.

We may now turn to examine more carefully the second and third parts of the ode, and we shall find them more closely connected with the first than might have been suspected.

The Isthmian victory which Poseidon gave to Xenocrates,

εὐάρματον ἄνδρα γεραίρων Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος,

is the original cause of the hymn and is mentioned first. Then comes the old triumph at Crisa, and a more recent victory at Athens, where Nicomachus drove the chariot of Xenocrates, deftly handling the reins. The same skilful driver won for Theron his victory at Olympia. We should like to know who this Nicomachus was; whether he was a kinsman of those whose horses he drove so well. He must have been a person of some distinction, for he was in a position to offer hospitality to the Elean σπονδοφόροι who proclaimed the sacred truce; and in return for that hospitality they shewed him special honour, when he 'fell upon the knees of golden victory'.

The literal driving of Nicomachus reminded the poet, who composed the Sixth Pythian, of the figurative driving of Thrasybulus. As Nicomachus was saluted by the Eleans ἀδυπνόῳ φωνᾷ, so Thrasybulus was rewarded by a honeyed song. This is brought out by a group of verbal echoes, signalling back to the opening lines of the hymn.

(*a*) 21 **ῥυσίδιφρον** : 2 **δίφρον**,

(*b*) 21 **φωτός** : 1 **φῶτες**,

(*c*) 24 **ἔργον** : 6 **ἐργάτις**,

(*d*) 25 **ἀδυπνόῳ** : 5 **ἀδίσταν**,

(*e*) 25 **φωνᾷ** : 8 **μαλθακόφωνοι**,

(*f*) 26 **χρυσέας** : 1 **χρυσαμπύκων**,

(*g*) Songs and Thrasybulus are old friends, even as the Eleans and Nicomachus:

23 **ἀνέγνων** : 30 **ἀγνῶτες** (cp. 12).

But to understand the full significance of these signals we must observe carefully the words **παθόντες πού τι φιλόξενον ἔργον**. The sweet salutation of the Eleans was a return for the hospitality of Nicomachus. And so, Pindar sug-

## METRICAL ANALYSIS.

(*Rhythm: dactyloepitritic.*)

### STROPHE.

– | – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏒ – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏓ .
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ – . – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – .
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ – ⏒ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏒
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏒ – ⏑ – ⏒
*v.* 5. – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – ⏒

M. Schmidt divides the strophe into two parts, A (*vv.* 1, 2), A′ (*vv.* 3, 4, 5), each of 18 feet. He counts the anacrusis of the first line as equivalent to an epitrite.

### EPODE.

– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏒ – ⏑ ⏓ .
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ – –
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ – ⏓
– ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ .
*v.* 5. – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – .
– ⏑ ⏑͡⏑ – – ⏑ – –

M. Schmidt formulates thus:

A (*v.* 1) = (4 + 5 =) 9 feet
B (*vv.* 2, 4) = (6 + 4 + 6 =) 16 feet
A′ (*vv.* 5, 6) = (5 + 4 =) 9 feet.

According to this analysis the first two dactyls of *v.* 1 are followed by two trisemoi (– . – .) and the first two dactyls of *v.* 2 are also followed by two trisemoi.

## ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙ Β'.

## ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΕΙ ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΙΝΩι

### ΑΡΜΑΤΙ.

Οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θρασύβουλε, φῶτες, οἳ χρυσαμπύκων  στρ. α'.
ἐς δίφρον Μοισᾶν ἔβαινον κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι,
ῥίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους,

1. **Οἱ μὲν πάλαι** κ.τ.λ.] *The men of old, O Thrasybulus, who stepped into the car of the gold-filleted Muses in concert with the sounding Lyre, used lightly to aim at boys shafts of honey-voiced hymns.*—οἱ **μὲν** πάλαι is taken up by νῦν **δ'** in l. 9.—**χρυσαμπύκων**, in the Iliad an epithet of steeds. Pindar has it of Lachesis in *Ol.* VII. 64 and of the Hours in *frag.* 30; of the Muses also in *Pyth.* III. 89. In *Ol.* XIII. 65 we find χρυσάμπυκα χαλινόν.

**οἳ**, MSS. ὅσοι, possibly a dittographia: ΦΩΤΕϹΕϹΟΙ read as φῶτες ὅσοι.

2. **δίφρον**] The first syllable of δίφρος is four times long and four times short (as here) in Pindar. The car of the Muses is found in *Ol.* IX. 81 εἴην εὑρησιεπὴς ἀναγεῖσθαι πρόσφορος ἐν Μοισᾶν δίφρῳ where the scholiast explains: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν ὑψηλῇ ποιήσει ἣν αἱ Μοῦσαι δωροῦνται, also in *Pyth.* X. 65 ἅρμα Πιερίδων τετράορον, and *Isth.* VII. 62 Μοισαῖον ἅρμα.

**συναντόμενοι**] *meeting with.* This verb occurs twice in the Second Olympian Ode: l. 39

ἐξ οὗπερ ἔκτεινε Λᾷον μόριμος υἱὸς
συναντόμενος,

and l. 95

κόρος,
οὐ δίκᾳ συναντόμενος,

*Envy not confederate with justice.* Here the poets are supposed to meet Phorminx as they ascend the cars of song.—**φόρμιγγι**, half personified; see my note on *Nem.* V. 24.—**κλυτᾷ**, probably in a physical sense *audible, loud;* most commentators however regard it as bearing its ordinary sense, *glorious, noble, fair.*

3. **ῥίμφα**] in an offhand way, without calculation ('ohne langes Ueberlegen', Mezger). The shade of meaning is exactly expressed by *temere* 'heedlessly' in Horace's *temere insecutae Orphea silvae.* Compare Aeschylus *Agam.* 407 βέβακεν ῥίμφα διὰ πυλᾶν of Helen. Mr Tyrrell compares Tennyson's line in *Locksley Hall* 'In the spring a young man's fancy *lightly* turns to thoughts of love'. The word occurs only here in Pindar, but we have ῥιμφάρματος in *Ol.* III. 37.—**παιδείους** and **ἐτόξευον** are also ἅπαξ εἰρημένα in

*ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας*
*εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἁδίσταν ὀπώραν.* 5

*ἁ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής πω τότ' ἦν οὐδ' ἐργάτις·* *ἀντ. α'.*
*οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖαι μελίφθογγοι ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας*
*ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί.*

Pindar. For the metaphor cp. *Isth.* IV. 47 *γλῶσσά μοι τοξεύματ' ἔχει κ.τ.λ.*—**παιδείους ὕμνους** are love-songs addressed to boys. Schol. *ὅτι δὲ περὶ παιδικοῦ ἔρωτος ἦν τοῖς λυρικοῖς ἡ τῶν ποιημάτων σπουδή, δημώδης ὁ λόγος. ταῦτα δὲ τείνει καὶ εἰς τοὺς περὶ Ἀλκαῖον καὶ Ἴβυκον καὶ Ἀνακρέοντα καὶ εἴ τινες ἄλλοι τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ δοκοῦσι περὶ τὰ παιδικὰ ἠσχολῆσθαι· οὗτοι γὰρ παλαιότεροι Πινδάρου.*

**μελιγάρυας**, this epithet occurs also in *Nem.* III. 4, *Ol.* XI. 4 and *Pyth.* III. 64. The note of *honey* recurs in l. 7 and l. 32.

4, 5. **ὅστις**] The antecedent is *παῖδες* implied in *παιδείους*. The construction of a singular relative after a plural conception is familiar; the meaning in plain prose is 'hymns in honour of boys who were both fair and of fitting age'. **Ἀφροδίτας** depends on **μνάστειραν**, which, as the feminine of *μναστήρ*, means *wooing*. The season of ripeness, the summer of life, is said to woo Aphrodite. See note *πολέμου μναστῆρα*, *Nem.* I. 16. The schol. explains *μνήμην ἐμποιοῦσαν*, and so most editors. It may be readily conceded that to the minds of Pindar's contemporaries the word suggested *μιμνάσκω* and its cognates as well as *μνάομαι*, which they doubtless regarded as a cognate also. —**εὐθρόνου** suggests a statue of the goddess sitting. Compare *εὐθρόνου Κλεοῦς* in *Nem.* III. 83, *εὐθρόνοις Ὥραισι*, *Pyth.* IX. 60, *εὐθρόνοις Κάδμοιο κούραις*, *Ol.* II. 22. Homer has *ἐΰθρονος Ἠώς*.—**ὀπώραν**, cp. *Nem.* V. 6.

6. **ἁ Μοῖσα** *κ.τ.λ.*] *For in those days the Muse was not yet mercenary nor hireling, nor did Terpsichora traffic in sweet honey-voiced warbling songs with silvered faces.*—The Muse mentioned in l. 6 is named in l. 7—Terpsichora who presides over lyric poetry. Von Leutsch tried to make out that 'the Muse' is Erato, and Mr Fennell adopts this view. But there is no mention of Erato in the Ode, and there is nothing to suggest any opposition between the Muse who was not hireling and Terpsichora who did not traffic. On the contrary, both the clauses, connected by *οὐδέ*, are parts of the same thought. The opposition is between past and present, not between choral and erotic poetry.—**φιλοκερδής**, in Pindar only here. The word is first found in Theognis 199 *φιλοκερδέϊ θυμῷ*.—**ἐργάτις**, feminine of *ἐργάτης a day-labourer*. The scholiast, who explains *ὅ ἐστιν αἰτοῦσα μισθὸν ἐφ' οἷς ἔπραττεν*, quotes Callimachus (*frag.* 77)

*οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω*
*τὴν Μοῦσαν ὡς ὁ Κεῖος Ὑλλίχου νέπους*,

an allusion clearly to this verse of Pindar who was generally supposed to be aiming a shaft at Simonides. Compare the use of *ἐργασία* for *gain, trade.*

7. **ἐπέρναντο**] *πέρνημι* is not found elsewhere in Pindar. The short final vowel is lengthened here, as usual, before *γλυκύς*: there are three exceptions, *Nem.* IV. 45, VII. 52 and *Ol.* I. 19.—**μελίφθογγοι**, also in *Ol.* VI. 21 (*Μοῖσαι*) and *Isth.* IV. 9 (*ἀοιδαῖς*). Heyne and Boeckh, followed by Bergk, needlessly read *μελιφθόγγου*.—**Τερψιχόρας**, *ἅπαξ εἰρ.* in Pindar.

8. **ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα**] There is nothing bitter or even depreciatory in this phrase. It is not intended as a reproach to the songs, on which caressing words, *γλυκεῖαι, μελίφθογγοι, μαλθακόφωνοι*, are bestowed. The songs are compared to maidens; and for maidens

νῦν δ' ἐφίητι τὸ τὠργείου φυλάξαι
ῥῆμ' ἀλαθείας ἐτᾶς ἄγχιστα βαῖνον· 10

ἀργύρεαι πρόσωπα would be high praise. Alcman has τό τ' ἀργύριον πρόσωπον of the fair face of Agesichora (*fr.* 23 p. 2, l. 55), in contrast with her golden hair (χρυσὸς ὣς ἀκήρατος l. 54). And so here a contrast is intended between the ἀοιδαί with *silver* faces and the muses of *golden* fillets of i. 1 (χρυσαμπύκων). And if Pindar had written ἀργύρεαι, the point—an allusion to ἄργυρος money,—would have been clear enough. Literally describing the fair faces of the maidens, it would have suggested the silver paid for the poems. Cp. Anacreon *fr.* 33 (quoted in the schol.) οὐδ' ἀργυρέη κω τότ' ἔλαμπε πειθώ. But ἀργυρωθεῖσαι is a happy hit; for it is literally appropriate both to the figure and to the thing figured. In regard to the girls of the metaphor, it means that their faces are painted, as they are for sale, to render them more attractive (so schol. πρόσωπον κεκοσμημέναι καὶ λαμπρυνθεῖσαι ὅτι τὰ ὤνια ὡς τῶν πωλούντων τὰ πρόσωπα κοσμοῦνται); while in regard to the songs, it could mean *rewarded with silver*, as in *Nem.* X. 43 ἀργυρωθέντες σὺν οἰνηραῖς φιάλαις. It is possible that there is a further allusion; see *Appendix* C. It is to be noted that in *Pyth.* XI. 41 the voice of Pindar's Muse is conceived as *silver-lined:* Μοῖσα, τὸ δὲ τεόν, εἰ μισθοῦ γε (reading uncertain) συνέθευ παρέχειν φωνὰν ὑπάργυρον. There is an allusion to paid poems in Aeschylus, *Agam.* 978, μαντιπολεῖ δ' ἀκέλευστος ἄμισθος ἀοιδά.

**μαλθακόφωνοι**, a Pindaric coinage, only here; perhaps an echo of Sappho's μελλιχόφωνοι (Aristaenetus I. 10, Bergk *frag.* 129).

9. **νῦν δ'**] opposed to πάλαι of l. 1.—The subject of **ἐφίητι** (Doric for ἐφίησι) is Terpsichora: *now she biddeth us observe the saying of the Argive man.* The Argive man was Aristodamus, as we learn from Alcaeus in a fragment quoted by the scholiast:

τοῦτον δὲ τὸν Ἀριστόδημον Πίνδαρος μὲν οὐ τίθησιν ἐξ ὀνόματος, ὡς προδήλου ὄντος ὅς ἐστιν ὁ τοῦτο εἰπών, μόνον δὲ ἐσημειώσατο τὴν πατρίδα, ὅτι Ἀργεῖος· Ἀλκαῖος δὲ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα καὶ τὴν πατρίδα τίθησιν, οὐκ Ἄργος ἀλλὰ Σπάρτην· Ὡς γὰρ δή ποτέ φασιν Ἀριστόδημον ἐν Σπάρτᾳ λόγον οὐκ ἀπάλαμνον εἰπεῖν· χρήματ' ἀνήρ· πενιχρὸς δὲ οὐδεὶς πέλετ' ἐσλὸς οὐδὲ τίμιος.

Thus for Alcaeus Aristodamus was a Spartan. The scholiast justifies Pindar for calling him an Argive by Homer's Ἑλένην Ἀργείαν, Ἀργεῖος being practically equivalent to Peloponnesian. Pindar however may have known that Aristodamus was originally connected with Argos. He may have had a reason for thus designating the author of the proverb here; see next note.—For the verse of Alcaeus see also Diogenes Laert. I. 31 and Suidas *sub* χρήματα. Bergk (*frag.* 49) restores thus:

ὣς γὰρ δήποτ' Ἀριστόδαμόν φαισ' οὐκ
ἀπάλαμνον ἐν Σπάρτᾳ λόγον
εἴπην· χρήματ' ἄνηρ, πένιχρος δ' οὐδεὶς
πέλετ' ἔσλος οὐδὲ τίμιος.

—**φυλάξαι**, so in *Ol.* III. 41 φυλάσσοντες μακάρων τελετάς.

10. **ἀλαθείας ἐτᾶς**] Bergk's brilliant emendation for MSS. ἀληθείας (the Triclinian ε ζ give ἀληθείας καλῶς, ed. Rom. ῥῆμα τῆς ἀληθείας). **ἐτᾶς** (accepted by E. Boehmer) easily fell out on account of its likeness to the last four letters of the foregoing word:

ΑΛΑΘΕΙΑϹΕΤΑϹ.

For this Pindaric word, whose traces were first found by Bergk, see *Nem.* VII. 25 (with my note) where we have the same expression ἐτὰν ἀλάθειαν. Cp. *Nem.* VII. 85, X. 11 and 41. Of other proposals I may mention Hermann's ὁδῶν and Schnitzer's στάθμας.—When it is said that the saying of Aristodamus 'comes very near ἐτὰ ἀλάθεια', the form of expression is not without its signifi-

ἐπ. α'.

*Χρήματα, χρήματ' ἀνήρ, ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θ' ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων.*
*ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὢν σοφός, οὐκ ἀγνῶτ' ἀείδω*

cance. It is not the same as simply saying that the proverb is true (ἀλαθές). Like ἔτυμος and ἐτήτυμος (see Verrall's *Appendix* II. to his edition of the *Sept. c. Thebas*), ἐτός (see notes on passages cited above) may have the special force of etymological truth. Here the truth in question is χρήματ' ἀνήρ, 'money makes the man'. But what was the import of this in special relation to Aristodamus? To the Argive who had to do with Argives, χρήματα χρήματ' ἀνήρ was only a generalisation of a particular conclusion which might have been expressed thus:

**ἄργυρος ἄργυρος 'Αργεῖος,**

'Argive, thy name is argent', words to which Pindar's description 'coming very near verbal truth' would be strictly applicable. If the poet intended this verbal suggestion, he has taken care, as indeed was incumbent on him, to render it easy to penetrate by placing in close proximity the striking word ἀργυρωθεῖσαι and the, perhaps unusual, designation of Aristodamus, 'Αργείου. This explains too his motive in choosing that designation.

For **ἄγχιστα** with genitive see *Nem.* IX. 55.

11. **Χρήματα** κ.τ.λ.] *'Money, money is the man', he said, when both money and friends had together failed him.* **χρήματα** is subject and **ἀνήρ** predicate.—**ὃς**, demonstrative (cp. ὃς δ' ἔφη) as is shewn by the order of the words (so Mr Fennell takes it); we should therefore punctuate after βαῖνον. The ordinary explanation makes ὅς relative (to τώργείου). Bergk suggested ὃ φᾶ 'admissa syllaba ancipiti'.—**θ' ἅμα**, so MSS. Boeckh's θαμά gives inferior sense (Bergk and Mr Fennell θάμα). The point is that when the man's money deserted him, his friends deserted him too: **ἅμα** brings out this. There is no reason to suppose that in his case the experience was repeated several times.—**λειφθείς** equivalent to στερηθείς, but with the idea of being *left behind by*, *left in the lurch*. λείπομαι with the genitive is not found elsewhere in Pindar.

12. **ἐσσὶ γὰρ ὢν σοφός**] 'I need say no more, for you are wise and can penetrate my meaning; therefore I go on to your father's Isthmian victory'. The σοφία imputed to Thrasybulus is clearly his knowledge of poetry; mentioned in *Pyth.* VI. 49 σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων.—Of **γὰρ ὢν** (γὰρ οὖν), in explanation of something which is understood but not expressed, there is a good parallel instance in Herodotus V. 34 οἱ γὰρ ὦν Νάξιοι οὐδὲν πάντως προσεδέκοντο ἐπὶ σφέας τὸν στόλον τοῦτον ὁρμήσεσθαι. Here γὰρ ὦν explains the fact not expressed but implied (in the following sentence) that the Naxians had made no preparations for a siege. In most cases γὰρ οὖν is merely an emphatic γάρ, as in εὖ γὰρ οὖν λέγεις (*Antig.* 771), καὶ γὰρ οὖν πρέπει (*Agam.* 524).

**οὐκ ἀγνῶτ'**] So B; οὐκ ἄγνωτ', D. Ancient interpreters were divided between (1) οὐκ ἀγνῶτ(ι), 'to a man not ignorant' (ἀγνώς active, as below l. 30), and (2) οὐκ ἄγνωτα (schol. οὐ περὶ ἀγνώτων, φησίν, ᾄδω). There is no trace in the scholia of (3) ἀγνῶτ(α) adopted by modern interpreters (except Hartung, Christ, Boehmer, who read ἄγνωτα, and Kayser who approves ἀγνῶτι). οὐκ ἀγνῶτα νίκαν is *a victory not obscure*, ἀγνώς bearing its ordinary passive sense *unknown*. The active sense is much rarer (though it appears in the two other passages in Pindar where the word occurs: below l. 30 and *Pyth.* IX. 58), and, as far as we can judge, was later; for we find the passive use in Homer (ε 79), but not the active. So ἀγνῶτα φωνήν, Aesch. *Agam.* 1051. Sophocles has both the passive (*Ant.* 1001, *Phil.* 1008) and the active

Ἰσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν,
τὰν Ξενοκράτει Ποσειδάων ὀπάσαις,
Δωρίων αὐτῷ στεφάνωμα κόμᾳ 15
πέμπεν ἀναδεῖσθαι σελίνων,

εὐάρματον ἄνδρα γεραίρων, Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος. στρ. β'.
ἐν Κρίσᾳ δ' εὐρυσθενὴς εἶδ' Ἀπόλλων μιν πόρε τ' ἀγλαΐαν

(*Oed. Rex*, 681, 1133) ἀγνώς. In his note on *Oed. Rex*, 681, Professor Jebb well illustrates the probability that the passive sense was the older by setting the Homeric ἀγνῶτες ἀλλήλοισι beside Thucydides' ἀγνῶτες ἀλλήλων (III. 53).—In deference to the authority of B and to the consensus of modern opinion I have kept ἀγνῶτ' in the text, but I am not sure that ἄγνωτ' (as Christ reads) may not be right. The plural οὐκ ἄγνωτα would be appropriate in introducing the list of victories which are forthwith enumerated. 'No unknown theme sing I:—even an Isthmian victory, favour of Poseidon,—and a Pythian victory (l. 18)—and one at Athens (l. 19)'. In this case there would be a mild anacoluthon. Instead of proceeding in l. 18 Πυθίαν τ' ἀγλαΐαν, coordinate with Ἰσθμίαν νίκαν and in apposition with οὐκ ἄγνωτα, the poet would stop short at φάος and give a new sentence to the Pythian victory.

13. **ἵπποισι**] Instrumental dative with νίκα, corresponding to the phrase ἵπποις νικᾶν. Cp. *Pyth.* VI. 17 εὔδοξον ἅρματι νίκαν.

14. **Ξενοκράτει**] In the corresponding lines of the other epodes the second foot is a spondee; here it is a trochee. But there is no reason to doubt the MSS. reading, even though D has the variant ὀπάσσαις, and few will be disposed to entertain M. Schmidt's transposition τὰν Ποσειδάων ὀπάσσαις Ξενϝοκράτει.—**τὰν** goes only with the participle ὀπάσαις.—Pindar has both Ποσειδάων and Ποσειδᾶν.

15. **Δωρίων**] schol. ἀπὸ Κορινθιακῶν αὐτῷ σελίνων στεφάνων. So in *Nem.* IV. 88, the Isthmian 'parsley' is called Κορινθίοις σελίνοις, which explains Δωρίων here.—**αὐτῷ** (so MSS. and schol.) in the same clause as Ξενοκράτει, to whom it refers, may seem needless, as there is no ambiguity. Hence Bergk proposed to read αὔων or αὖον, as according to the scholia the Isthmian crown was of withered leaves, in distinction from the Nemean, which was of fresh leaves (schol. τοῖς οὖν τὰ Ἴσθμια ἀγωνιζομένοις σέλινον ξηρὸν ὁ στέφανος). It would be rash to touch the text. Editors have missed the point of **αὐτῷ** and the point of the imperfect **πέμπεν**; both points are closely connected. If we apprehend that Xenocrates died before the wreath of his Isthmian victory reached him, the meaning of the words is clear. Poseidon was sending the crown to Xenocrates himself and none other (αὐτῷ); it reached Acragas, but Xenocrates was not there to receive it. Thus αὐτῷ expresses that Poseidon's intention was that Xenocrates should himself wear the crown; πέμπεν expresses that the intention was not carried out.—**στεφάνωμα κόμᾳ** (so Boeckh for MSS. κόμα) *a garland for his hair*, **ἀναδεῖσθαι** *to bind it with* (MSS. ἀνδεῖσθαι, corrected by Schmid).

16. **σελίνων**] probably wild celery, not parsley (cp. Mr Sandys, *Class. Review*, V. p. 308).

17. **εὐάρματον**] of Hiero *Pyth.* IV. 5, of Theba *fr.* 195, of the city of Cyrene *Pyth.* IV. 7.—**Ἀκραγαντίνων**, so Ἀκράγας *Ol.* II. 6 and 100, but Ἀκράγας *Pyth.* XII. 2, VI. 6, *Ol.* III. 2.—**φάος** is applied to Hiero in *Pyth.* III. 75.

18. **εὐρυσθενής**] A favourite word of Pindar (epithet of Poseidon in *Ol.* XIII. 80, of Telamon *Nem.* III. 36, &c.). *Apollo of wide-reaching might regarded*

*καὶ τόθι κλειναῖς τ' Ἐρεχθειδᾶν χαρίτεσσιν ἀραρὼς*
*ταῖς λιπαραῖς ἐν Ἀθάναις, οὐκ ἐμέμφθη* 20
*ῥυσίδιφρον χεῖρα πλαξίπποιο φωτός,*

*τὰν Νικόμαχος κατὰ καιρὸν νεῖμ' ἁπάσαις ἁνίαις.* ἀντ. β'.
*ὄντε καὶ κάρυκες Ὡρᾶν ἀνέγνων, σπονδοφόροι Κρονίδα*

*him at Crisa and awarded him bright grace.* Schol. *εὐμενῶς ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἐθεάσατο τὸν Ξενοκράτην*, whence Kayser (*Lect. Pind.* p. 90) proposed *εὔφρων ἄναξ* for *εὐρυσθενής*, a good instance of the wrong method of using the scholia.—**μιν**, Boeckh *νιν*.—For **πόρε** in this sense cp. above, *Isth.* I. 61.—**ἀγλαΐαν** means 'a splendid victory'. This victory is celebrated in the Sixth Pythian hymn.

19. **τόθι**] used by Pindar both as a demonstrative and as a relative.—**τ'** connects *τόθι* and *ταῖς λιπαραῖς ἐν Ἀθάναις ἀραρώς, κ.τ.λ.* *And, both there and in rich Athens where he secured the famous and gracious guerdon of the Erechthidae, he had no cause to blame, &c.* The MSS. omit **τ'**, which has been happily restored by Bergk. The received reading, which makes *τόθι* anticipate *ταῖς λιπαραῖς ἐν Ἀθάναις*, is intolerable. The omission of *τ'* may have been designed; due to the erroneous idea that Thrasybulus, not Nicomachus, drove the chariot of Xenocrates at the Pythian contest. Compare schol. on *Pyth.* VI. 15, Θρασύβουλε· *τοῦτον δὲ ὡς φιλοπάτορα καὶ προεστῶτα τῆς ἱππικῆς ἐπαινεῖ, οὐχ ὥς τινες ἐβουλήθησαν, ἡνίοχον, ὁ γὰρ ἡνίοχος Νικόμαχός ἐστιν ὡς ἐκ τῶν Ἰσθμιονικῶν δῆλός ἐστιν.*—Observe that the last syllable of *τόθι* is lengthened before *κλ*.

**χαρίτεσσιν**] *gracious victories*, like *ἀγλαΐαν* in the foregoing verse.

**ἀραρώς**] Schol. *ταῖς ἐνδόξοις τῶν Ἀθηναίων χάρισιν ἡρμοσμένος.* See note on *Nem.* V. 24, where the meaning of this generally misinterpreted word is elucidated.

20. **λιπαραῖς Ἀθάναις**] see note on *Nem.* IV. 18.—**οὐκ ἐμέμφθη**, *had no cause to blame.*

21, 22. **ῥυσίδιφρον** *κ.τ.λ.*] Mezger explains satisfactorily: At the decisive moment (*κατὰ καιρόν*) Nicomachus 'gave his hand' to all the reins, that is, let the team go at full speed, but at the same time applied the whip (*πλαξίπποιο*) and thus saved the chariot from a collision (*ῥυσίδιφρον*).—**ῥῡσίδῐφρον**, like *ῥυσίβωμος*, *altar protecting* (Aeschylus, *Eum.* 920), *ῥυσίπολις* (Aesch. *S. c. Th.* 130), formed by Pindar for this place, is not found elsewhere.—**πλάξιππος** occurs in *Ol.* VI. 85 as an epithet of Theba.

**νεῖμ' ἁπάσαις**] Hermann's emendation of MSS. *νωμᾷ πάσαις*. The mistake or 'correction' of *νῶμ* for *νεῖμ* was natural, as *νωμάω* was a *vox propria* for driving (cp. *Isth.* I. 15 *χερσὶ νωμάσαντ'*). *χεῖρα νέμειν ἁνίαις* is equivalent to *dare* or *immittere habenas*. The force of **ἁπάσαις** (not the same as *πάσαις*) is that the charioteer relaxed all the reins of the four horses by a single movement, at the same moment: all the separate reins being in his hand *as one.* **κατὰ καιρόν,**' like Virgil's '*foedere certo* et premere et laxas sciret dare iussus habenas'.—Bergk proposed (weakly) *νεῖμ' ὁπάσσαις ἁνίαις*. Hartung read *τὰν Νικομάχου, κατὰ καιρὸν ὡς ἐνώμασ' ἁνίας* (which departs far more from the MSS. than Hermann's simple and admirable restoration).

23. **κάρυκες Ὡρᾶν**] 'Heralds of the seasons of the Olympian festivals'. Schol.: *ὄντινα τὸν νικηφόρον οἱ κήρυκες, φησίν, οἱ τὸν καιρὸν καὶ τὴν ὥραν τοῦ Ὀλυμπιακοῦ ἀγῶνος κηρύσσοντες καὶ σπονδοφόροι ὄντες τοῦ ἐν Ἤλιδι Διός, ἐγνώρισαν προπαθόντες τι ἡδὺ παρ' αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ φιλόξενον τῆς ὑποδοχῆς.* The **σπονδο-**

*Ζηνὸς Ἀλεῖοι, παθόντες πού τι φιλόξενον ἔργον·*
*ἁδυπνόῳ τέ νιν ἀσπάζοντο φωνᾷ* 25
*χρυσέας ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας*

*γαῖαν ἀνὰ σφετέραν, τὰν δὴ καλέοισιν Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς* ἐπ. β'.
*ἄλσος· ἵν' ἀθανάτοις Αἰνησιδάμου*

**φόροι Ζηνός**, *bearers of the truce of Zeus*, proclaimed the Sacred Truce observed throughout Hellas during the days of the Olympian festival. The *σπονδοφόροι* are mentioned by Pausanias (v. 15, 6).—**ἀνέγνων**, *recognized*, as in Homer and Herod. (II. 91), but never in Attic (see Jebb's note on *Oed. Rex*, 1348). Nicomachus, as explained in the next line, was already known to the Elean priests or fetials, or whatever we are to call them, as a guest-friend. *ἀναγινώσκω* occurs in one other passage in Pindar, *Ol.* X. 1, where it has the additional suggestion of *reading*. The form *ἔγνων* as 3rd plur. is also preserved in *Pyth.* IX. 79, but *ἔγνον* occurs in *Pyth.* IV. 120, and perhaps we should read with Ahrens *ἀνέγνον* here.

24. **πού τι**] restored by Schmid. B has *ποῦ τι* and D *πον τοι*. Compare *Ol.* I. 28 *καί πού τι*. **πον**, *I trow*.—Dissen speculates as to where it was that Nicomachus entertained the Elean 'fetials'. He decides for Athens, supposing the occasion to have been the lesser Panathenaea at which Nicomachus drove a car for Xenocrates. But he seems to hold that the recognition was at Athens, not at Olympia; thus referring *ἀνέγνων* and *παθόντες* to the same occasion. According to my view *παθόντες* explains *ἀνέγνων*; they recognized him, having on a previous occasion experienced his hospitality. Mr Fennell supposes that Nicomachus was 'proxenos of Elis'.—**φιλόξενος**, elsewhere an epithet of persons, *Nem.* I. 20 and *Ol.* III. 1.

25. **ἁδυπνόῳ τε** *κ.τ.λ.*] *And with sweet-breathing voice offered him greeting, when he fell at the knees of Golden Victory, in their own land, which men call the Precinct of Olympian Zeus.* It is clear that the greeting was given at Olympia; **γαῖαν ἀνὰ σφετέραν** goes with *ἀσπάζοντο* as well as with *πίτνοντα*. On a former occasion they had been his guests in another land; he was now their guest *in their land*. It seems to me that Dissen, who places the greeting at Athens, gives a well-nigh impossible sense to *πιτνῶντα* (as he reads), 'tanquam eum qui ante apud ipsos in Olympia vicisset'. The imperfect participle would hardly do here. —**ἁδύπνόῳ φωνᾷ** (but in *Ol.* XIII. 22 *Μοῖσ' ἁδύπνοος*). Cp. Sappho *fr.* 61 *παρθένον ἀδύφωνον*.

26. **ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας**] In the Fifth Nemean, Euthymenes is said to fall in the arms of Victory; l. 42 *Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων*. The idea of both figures is that Victory embraced the victor.—**πίτνοντα** is the reading of B, and rightly preserved by Bergk. D has *πίτνοντο*, ε ζ *πιτνῶντο*. Ceporinus, whom the editors have followed, read *πιτνῶντα* (from *πιτνέω*, a form rightly questioned by Elmsley).

27. **ἀνά**] See *Appendix* H.—**καλέοισιν** Aeolic for *καλέουσιν*. The subject is 'men', not the *σπονδοφόροι*.

28. **ἄλσος**] Not only the Altis, but the whole of sacred Olympia. Villoison proposed to read Ἄλτιν.—**ἀθανάτοις ἐν τιμαῖς ἔμιχθεν** for *ἀθανάτοις τιμαῖς ἐνέμιχθεν* *were charged with immortal honours;* compare *Ol.* I. 90 *ἐν αἱμακουρίαις ἀγλααῖσι μέμικται* (tmesis for *ἐμμέμικται*). Dissen explains **ἀθανάτοις** as 'consulto electum epitheton quum uterque frater iam defunctus esset'. But Pindar himself explains *ἀθανάτοις* (as Mezger has pointed out) in the following sentence which

*παῖδες ἐν τιμαῖς ἔμιχθεν.*
*καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀγνῶτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι* 30
*οὔτε κώμων, ὦ Θρασύβουλ', ἐρατῶν,*
*οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν.*

*οὐ γὰρ πάγος, οὐδὲ προσάντης ἁ κέλευθος γίνεται,* *στρ. γ'.*
*εἴ τις εὐδόξων ἐς ἀνδρῶν ἄγοι τιμὰς Ἑλικωνιάδων.*
*μακρὰ δισκήσαις ἀκοντίσσαιμι τοσοῦθ', ὅσον ὀργὰν* 35

begins with **καὶ γάρ.**—**Αἰνησιδάμου παῖδες**, Theron and Xenocrates; the victory was won by the chariot of Theron, and was celebrated by Pindar in the Second and Third Olympian Odes. The scholiast curiously says: *Αἰνησιδάμου παῖδες Θήρων καὶ Δεινομένης ὧν κυρίως μνημονεύει ὡς Σικελιωτῶν τυράννων.* What was he thinking of?

30. **ἀγνῶτες**] active; see note on l. 12 above.—The acquaintance of the house of the tyrants of Akragas with song ensures immortality to their fame.—**ἐντί** Doric for *εἰσί.*

31. **ἐρατῶν**] Cp. Alcman, *fr.* 45 *ἄρχ' ἐρατῶν ἐπέων.*

32. **μελικόμπων**] *honey-ringing;* a Pindaric formation, only found here. This phrase signals to the *μελίφθογγοι ἀοιδαί* of l. 8.

33, 34. **οὐ γὰρ** κ.τ.λ.] These verses are usually explained to mean that 'It is easy to utter praises of men of high renown' (Fennell). So the scholiast: *οὐ τραχεῖα, φησίν, ἡ ὁδὸς τοῖς τοὺς ἐνδόξους ἐπαινοῦσιν ἄνδρας.* Similarly Dissen, Mezger, &c. According to this view the emphasis is on *εὐδόξων*, *τις* means a poet, *Ἑλικωνιάδων* depends on *τιμάς*, and *εἴ τις ἄγοι* is equivalent to *τῷ ἄγοντι.* Mr Fennell compares *Pyth.* VIII. 14 *κέρδος δὲ φίλτατον, ἑκόντος εἴ τις ἐκ δόμων φέροι.*

But another interpretation may be suggested which seems superior in point of sense. I hold that the road (*ἁ κέλευθος*) is not that trodden by poets to the houses of the renowned, but that trodden by the renowned and leading to immortality (*ἀθάνατοι τιμαί*). **τιμάς** takes up **τιμαῖς** in l. 29, and *Ἑλικωνιάδων* depends on *τις.* We may translate:

*For no hill rises nor does the way prove steep, if one of the maids of Helicon import honours to the homes of glorious men.*

That is: by the power of the Muses the *ἀνὴρ εὔδοξος* can easily secure *τιμαὶ ἀθάνατοι.*—Observe that **τις...Ἑλικωνιάδων** responds to **Τερψιχόρας**, last word of the second verse of the first antistrophos. There Terpsichora was said to traffic in songs; hence the Muse is conceived as *importing* praises; cp. *οἶνον ἄγειν* in Homer. This parallelism supports my interpretation.

**προσάντης** is not found elsewhere in Pindar, **πάγος** only in *Ol.* X. 49.

**ἐς ἀνδρῶν**, for the ellipse of *οἴκους*, cp. Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1362 *ἐς Γλύκης.*

35. **μακρὰ δισκήσαις**] *having hurled far*, *δισκέω* being used here in the general sense of hurling (not the discus as **ἀκοντίσσαιμι** shews). So schol. *μακρῶς καὶ μεγάλως τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον ῥίψαις.* Compare *Pyth.* I. 45 *μακρὰ δὲ ῥίψαις (ἄκοντα* in foregoing line) *ἀμεύσασθ' ἀντίους.* So Donaldson and Mezger. Dissen on the other hand thought that *δισκήσαις* retained and *ἀκοντίσσαιμι* surrendered each its special meaning.—*δισκέω* is Homeric (*η* 188). For *ἀκοντίζω* see *Isth.* I. 24, and, metaphorically as here, *Nem.* IX. 55.—**τοσοῦθ' ὅσον**, that is, may I surpass others in the excellence of my praises, as Xenocrates surpassed others in his disposition.—**ὀργὰν γλυκεῖαν**, like *εὐανθεῖ ὀργᾷ*

Ξεινοκράτης ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων γλυκεῖαν
ἔσχεν. αἰδοῖος μὲν ἦν ἀστοῖς ὁμιλεῖν,

ἱπποτροφίας τε νομίζων ἐν Πανελλάνων νόμῳ· ἀντ. γ΄.
καὶ θεῶν δαῖτας προσέπτυκτο πάσας· οὐδέ ποτε ξενίαν
οὖρος ἐμπνεύσαις ὑπέστειλ' ἱστίον ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν· 40
ἀλλ' ἐπέρα ποτὶ μὲν Φᾶσιν θερείαις,

*Pyth.* I. 89; *a sweet temper*. Thrasybulus, the son of Xenocrates, is described as endowed with like disposition in *Pyth.* VI. 52, γλυκεῖα δὲ φρὴν κ.τ.λ.—Mommsen notes the sigmatism of this verse.

36. **Ξεινοκράτης**] The name is important, as ξενία was one of the spheres in which he revealed his sweet temper (cp. l. 39). B and D have Ξενοκράτης.—**ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων**, *above other men;* for this use of ὑπέρ cp. *Nem.* IX. 54.—Observe **ἔσχεν** (not εἶχεν) *won* by practice.

37. **αἰδοῖος μὲν** κ.τ.λ.] For the corresponding δέ clause see next note.—**αἰδοῖος** has been taken in two ways (1) *venerabilis* (Dissen), (2) *verecundus* (Mezger and Rumpel). Mezger says that αἰδοῖος is opposed to ἀναιδής; there was no ὕβρις in the nature of the man. But (1) is the usual meaning of the word, and it yields good sense here. **ἀστοῖς** is better taken as dative of the persons interested than as depending on ὁμιλεῖν. **ὁμιλεῖν** 'to converse with' depends on αἰδοῖος. An English prose writer would express ὁμιλεῖν by the adverb—'socially'.

38. **τε**] stands for αἰδοῖος δὲ ἦν. For this principle and examples of it see *Appendix* A.—**ἱπποτροφίας** the rearing and training of horses. The adjective, ἱπποτρόφος, occurs in *Nem.* X. 41 and *Isth.* III. B 14.—**νομίζων**, *practising;* properly, *adopting as one's habit.* So often in Herodotus νομίζειν γλῶσσαν, ὀρτήν &c. Cp. Aeschylus *Choephoroi* 1003 νομίζειν ἀργυροστερῆ βίον. This verb occurs in only one other place in Pindar, *Isth.* IV. 2.—**ἐν Πανελλάνων νόμῳ** *according to the usage of the Panhellenes*, or in modern language, *after the custom of Hellenedom*, *according to the use of the Greek 'world'*. Schol. καὶ ἵππους τρέφων τῷ τῶν Ἑλλήνων νόμῳ καὶ ἔθει. For the phrase cp. *Nem.* X. 28 ἐν Ἀδραστείῳ νόμῳ. The use of ἐν is much the same in Λυδίῳ ἐν τρόπῳ ἀείδων *Ol.* XIV. 17 and such phrases as ἐν δίκᾳ *justly*, ἐν τύχᾳ, *rightly* (Aesch. *Agam.* 685).—**Πανέλλανες** occurs also in *Isth.* III. B 29, and in a similar connexion: Πανελλάνεσσι δ' ἐριζόμενοι δαπάνᾳ χαῖρον ἵππων.

39. **δαῖτας**] Restored from the scholia (τὰς ἑορτάς and θεῶν πανηγύρεις). MSS. διαίτας.—**προσέπτυκτο**, lit. had clasped to his breast; *welcomed.* Not elsewhere in Pindar.

**οὐδέ** κ.τ.λ.] Pindar would say that, however numerous were the guests who poured into the halls of the prince of Acragas, he did not slacken or reduce his hospitality. He expresses this by a metaphor from a ship, whose crew we should expect to furl sails if the wind blew unusually strong. We may render; *nor even did a wind, blowing on him at his hospitable board, cause him to furl a sail.* This is the explanation of Mr Fennell and Mezger. The same metaphor is used of liberality in *Pyth.* I. 91 ἐξίει—ἱστίον.—B and D preserve ξενίαν (so schol.); the unimportant MSS. have ξενίοις. For ὑπέστειλ', MSS. have ὑπέστειλεν, a common sort of error in the MSS. of Pindar, and due to the practice in old uncial MSS. of writing elided words in full, leaving the elision to the reader (as in Latin).

40. **ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν**] Cp. *frag.* 187 ἥρωες αἰδοίαν ἐμίγνυντ' ἀμφὶ τράπεζαν θαμά.

41. **ἀλλ'** κ.τ.λ.] *But he would cross*

*ἐν δὲ χειμῶνι πλέων Νείλου πρὸς ἀγάν.*

ἐπ. γ'.

*μή νυν, ὅτι φθονεραὶ θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται Ϝελπίδες,*
*μήτ' ἀρετάν ποτε σιγάτω πατρῴαν*
*μηδὲ τούσδ' ὕμνους· ἐπεί τοι* 45

*the sea to the Phasis in summer seasons, and in winter to the beach of the Nile.* The metaphor of the sailor is continued. The hospitality of Xenocrates was unstinting at all seasons. Naturally, there were most guests in summer, just as men then take their longest voyages; but in winter too there were as many as possible, just as a voyage to Egypt would be a long journey then.—**θερείαις**, understand *ὥραις*. Herodotus uses *ἡ θερείη* for summer, and in later Greek writers *ἡ θερεία* is not uncommon.—**πλέων** (l. 42) must be taken with **ἐπέρα**; though it stands in the second clause it belongs equally to both.

42. **ἀγάν**] The MSS. have *ἀκτάν*, which gives the right sense, but the scholia point to another reading: (Abel p. 391) *τὸ δὲ Νείλου πρὸς αὐγὰς τινὲς μὲν τὰς τοῦ Νείλου ῥύσεις τινὲς δὲ ὅτι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡ ῥύσις αὐτοῦ γίνεται· διὸ καὶ θερμοτάτης καὶ ὑγιεινῆς κράσεως μετέχει τὸ χωρίον*. That there is an error in the text of this note I do not believe. The writer was evidently struggling to explain the reading

*Νείλου πρὸς αὐγάν*,

which of course is inexplicable. Our data then for determining the text are *ἀκτάν* and *αὐγάν*. It is clear that if *ἀκτάν* had stood in the original text, it could never, in the ordinary course of transmission, become *αὐγάν*. So the problem is to find a word which might have been (1) correctly interpreted by *ἀκτάν* and (2) misread *αὐγάν*. A word which satisfies these conditions is **ἀγάν**, 'place where the wave breaks'. (*κύματος*) *ἀγή* is used by Apollonius, and there is no ambiguity here as it is joined to *Νείλου*. Schneidewin had already sagaciously conjectured *ἀγάς*, from the scholiast's *αὐγάς*, but *ἀκτάν* shews that the lost word was singular, and that *αὐγάς* is merely a paraphrase of *αὐγάν*. Mommsen considers *ἀγάν* improbable on account of *ῥύσεις* in the scholium; but (with Boeckh) he admits it in *Pyth.* II. 82 in a different sense.

43—45. **μή νυν** *κ.τ.λ.*] *Nor, because envious thoughts hang round the minds of mortals, let him hush either the excellence of his father,—nay, or even these hymns.*

Pindar had hitherto addressed Thrasybulus in the second person (ll. 1 and 31). He now turns away and speaks of him in the third, in order to address Nicasippus (l. 47). It may seem odd that the subject of **σιγάτω** is not expressed (Hartung wrote *σιγάσω*, Bergk proposed the plural imperative *σιγάντων* or Doric *σιγάντω*); we have to anticipate *ξεῖνον ἐμὸν ἠθαῖον* in l. 48. So Dissen ('Quod ne durum tibi videatur assume sequentia', &c.), but he should have added that such sort of anticipation is only possible within certain limits. What makes it possible here is the adjective **πατρῴαν**, which removes all ambiguity as to the subject of the imperative.

**φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται**] A very similar phrase is found in *Ol.* VII. 25 *ἀμφὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων φρασὶν ἀμπλακίαι ἀναρίθμητοι κρέμανται*. Dissen thinks that the metaphor in both cases is from nets which hang round what is ensnared.—**θνατῶν** is pointed: 'ordinary mortals' as opposed to the Aenesidamids who took to themselves 'immortal honours', **ἀθάνατοι** *τιμαί*. —**Ϝελπίδες**, in a wide sense, *the ideas and surmises* of interested persons.

**μηδὲ τούσδ' ὕμνους**] **μήτε** strictly requires a *μήτε* (or at least *τε*) to follow. **μηδέ**, where we should expect *μήτε*, is a designed anacoluthon, a trick of style, happily

*οὐκ ἐλινύσοντας αὐτοὺς εἰργασάμαν.*
*ταῦτα, Νικάσιππ', ἀπόνειμον, ὅταν*
*ξεῖνον ἐμὸν ἠθαῖον ἔλθῃς.*

used here, for an artistic effect. The poet beginning with *μήτ' ἀρετάν* leads us to expect that something else is to be mentioned coordinate with *ἀρετάν*. But when he comes to deprecate the hushing of his own hymns, it occurs to him that Thrasybulus would be more likely to leave the hymns unsung than to suppress his father's memory, and he expresses this difference in the two objects of *σιγάτω* by substituting **μηδέ**, *nay, nor yet*, for *μήτε*. Another instance of this trick of style is found in *Pyth.* VIII. 83, where defeated competitors in games are thus spoken of: *τοῖς* **οὔτε** *νόστος ὁμῶς* | *ἐπ' ἀλπνὸς ἐν Πυθιάδι κρίθη* | **οὐδὲ** *μολόντων παρ ματέρ' ἀμφὶ γέλως γλυκὺς* | *ὦρσεν χάριν*. Here *οὐδὲ* has rhetorical force, suggesting that the second clause is not quite on a level with the first. Not to receive a kind greeting from their mother would be a harder blow. So too in Thucyd. I. 25 (*κατά τε τὸ δίκαιον...ἅμα* **δὲ** *καὶ μίσει*).

46. **ἐλινύσοντας**] *to rest idle;* 'to take holiday'. Cp. *Nem.* V. 1 *ἐλινύσοντα ἀγάλματ' ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος ἑσταότ'*. Bergk *P. L. G.* III. *frag. adesp.* 90, 4 (ascribed to Pindar by Schneidewin) *ἀσκὸς δ' οὐδέ τις ἀμφορεὺς ἐλίνυ' ἐν δόμοις.*—**αὐτούς**, emphatic: 'whatever may be the case with other hymns'.

47, 48. **ταῦτα** κ.τ.λ.] **ἀπόνειμον** would have to mean '*deal out* to Thrasybulus as his share'; it could not mean merely 'deliver to him this hymn' or 'execute these commands'. If there were in the context a figure such as a treasury of hymns, of which one could be dealt to Thrasybulus, *ἀπόνειμον* would be intelligible. Moreover Nicasippus had a more important office than the mere delivery of the hymn. It is clear that he was not merely a friend taking charge of a packet but the chorêgos who was to conduct the celebration of the hymn in Pindar's place (see Introd. p. 37). We might expect a word referring either to the public performance or to a private recital of the hymn. Independently of the scholia, Mr Tyrrell suggested *ἀνάνειμον*, *recita*, and this finds support in the schol.: *τὸ γὰρ ἀπόνειμον ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνάγνωθι Σοφοκλῆς ἐν 'Αχαιῶν συλλόγῳ, σὺ δ' ἐν θρόνοισι γραμμάτων πτυχὰς ἔχων ἀπόνειμον †νέμει τίς οὐ πάρεστι τίς ξυνώμοσεν. καὶ Παρθένιος ἐν τῇ 'Αρήτῃ τὸ ἄννεμε ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνάγνωθι καὶ ἀννείμῃ, Δωριστὶ ὁ Βουκόλος.* The fragment of Sophocles has been variously restored (read perhaps *ἀνάνειμον εἴ τις οὐ πάρ' ὃς ξυνώμοσεν*, Tyrrell). The note reads as if the scholiast found *ἀνάνειμον*. The Doric passage he refers to is Theocritus, XVIII. 48, *ὡς παριών τις ἀννείμῃ*. If *ταῦτα ἀνάνειμον* is right, the poet bids his deputy 'read aloud' this composition when he reaches Thrasybulus. It is however just possible that *ἀπονέμω* may have been a technical expression for some function of the chorêgos.—**ἠθαῖον**, Doric for *ἠθεῖον*, used in Homer by those who are of equal rank, but in some respect (especially in age) inferior. Paris uses it to Hector. *ξεῖνον ἐμὸν ἠθαῖον* might be rendered *my honourable friend*.—Observe **ἔλθῃς** with a simple accusative of the person. There is no other instance of this in Pindar (though he often has the accus. of place, as *Ol.* XIV. 21, *Pyth.* IV. 52). Out of Pindar it is extremely rare. The only example I know is Soph. *Phil.* 141, *σὲ δ' ὦ τέκνον τόδ' ἐλήλυθεν πᾶν κράτος ὠγύγιον*, on which see Professor Jebb's note. We have *βαίνω* with accus. of person in Eur. *Hipp.* 1371. Professor Jebb observes that both the passage in Soph. and that in Eur. are lyric, and infers from the parody in Aristoph. (*Clouds*, 30) that 'a lyric boldness was felt in them'.

# ISTHMIAN III.

## INTRODUCTION.

### III. B[1].

### ODE IN HONOUR OF A VICTORY IN THE PANCRATION AT ISTHMUS WON BY MELISSUS OF THEBES.

THE Cleonymidae were a Theban family, noted for their wealth and for their devotion to the rearing of horses. They had also distinguished themselves in war, and by victories which their steeds won at some of the lesser or 'local' games, such as those at Sicyon and Athens. But there was one thing still lacking. There was one field in which they had sought but failed to win distinction. Their chariots had striven at some at least of the great Panhellenic games, but had never been successful. This was the 'skeleton in the closet'[2] of the Cleonymids. Their prosperity needed only a Panhellenic wreath—Olympian, Pythian, Isthmian or Nemean—to be complete. Such a wreath would be the τέλος. At length this desire was realized by Melissus, not however through the excellence of his steeds, but by his personal prowess in the pancration contest, at the Isthmian games. This success was welcome indeed to the Cleonymids, and Pindar their fellow-countryman was called upon to celebrate it in a fitting hymn.

The note of this hymn is the idea that by the victory of Melissus the glory of the Cleonymids reached its perfection—τέλος ἄκρον; and appropriately, as it seemed to Pindar, Melissus was the son of *Telesiades*[3]. In close connexion with this is the thought that the most important consequence of the victory is the Epinician hymn, to which it has led.

[1] For my view of the Third Isthmian see *Appendix* D. I have printed the text of III. A and III. B in the order in which they appear in all editions; but as III. A, according to my view, is chronologically later than III. B, it is convenient to deal with them in reverse order in the *Introduction*.

[2] This phrase is thus used by Professor Jebb in the preface to his ed. of the *Ajax*.

[3] Compare τέλος (l. 5), τέλος (l. 10), τέλος ἄκρον (l. 32), ἔρνει Τελεσιάδα, in an emphatic position (l. 45), and perhaps τέλος in l. 67.

The ode falls into three parts[1]. The first part celebrates the Cleonymids in their full glory,—as they are, after the recent victory. The second part deals with their past,—as they were before the recent victory. The third part celebrates Melissus, the successful, in contrast with his predecessors who failed. This contrast is pointed by the comparison of the Cleonymids, collectively, to Ajax—Pindar's constant type for unrecognized merit; and of Melissus to Heracles—his constant type for success.

1. The Cleonymids are an ancient family, and from the earliest times they are known to have been held in honour at Thebes; to have been the proxenoi of strangers from neighbouring cities, and to have been devoid of offence. But now at length their excellences, locally recognized always, are come forth from comparative obscurity; the victory of Melissus *lights them up* by this epinician hymn to which it has given occasion. They have touched the pillars of Heracles; their glory has gained its τέλος; there is no need to seek any excellence or meed of excellence beyond.

The Isthmian crown of Melissus was especially welcome at the time when it was won. For the hearth of his race had recently lost four men, who had fallen in some battle—hardly at Plataea[2]—so that the joy of the victory came after the winter of their grief like the freshness of spring. This is Pindar's metaphor: 'as the earth blossoms with crimson roses after wintry darkness'. The darkness is now lit up by the exploit of Melissus on the 'seabridge'. Poseidon, the earth mover, has granted a hymn.

2. This hymn is to awaken the ancient fame of the Cleonymids, which had fallen asleep; but will now be bright once more. They had gained victories in chariot races at Athens and at Sicyon, and had even been sung by former minstrels; and they had taken part in the 'national games' (πανaγυρίων ξυνᾶν), not sparing expense on their horses. You can never win if you never try; yet you may try long without winning. Success (the τέλος ἄκρον) is in a certain measure at the mercy of fortune; and fortune often wills that excellence shall not be *lit up* (ἀφάνεια, l. 31). Sometimes, too, the strength of the better man is overcome by the art of the inferior. There was Ajax, for example, who fell on his sword *in the late night*, and shed blame on the Greeks for their judgment in the matter of the arms. He was vanquished by the art of his rival.

But the ἀρετά of Ajax was *honoured* by Homer, even as the ἀρεταί of the

[1] Mezger states the *Grundgedanke* of the hymn (following Friederichs and others) thus: 'Wer Reichthum mit Siegesruhm verbindet und sich dabei frei hält von Uebermuth, der hat wahres Glück und ist würdig des Liedespreises'. —The significance of Ajax and Heracles in the ode has been generally recognized by commentators; but was best brought out by Perthes.

[2] What the battle was which was so fatal to the Cleonymids, we cannot possibly know. Thiersch referred it to the passages of arms between Thebes and Athens after the expulsion of the Pisistratids. Dissen maintained that no other than the battle of Plataea is meant. On that occasion the Thebans took the wrong side, from Pindar's point of view, and Mezger is disposed to see a hint of censure in μομφὰν ἔχει (III. B 36); but see note on that verse.

Cleonymids were *honoured* in old days at Thebes. This parallel is brought out by signals. The 1st verse of the 3rd strophe contains an accurate responsion to the 1st verse of the 1st antistrophos:

l. 7 τοὶ μὲν ὦν Θήβαισι τιμάεντες ἀρχᾶθεν κ.τ.λ.
l. 37 ἀλλ' Ὅμηρός τοι τετίμακεν κ.τ.λ.

Further, δι' ἀνθρώπων (l. 37) echoes ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους (l. 9); and ll. 9, 10 contain the same notion of the diffusion of fame as ll. 40, 41. Something more will be said on this passage presently.

3. Yes, it is the poet who transmits the inextinguishable beam of glory over land and sea;—such as the torch of hymns which I am now lighting for Melissus. May no freak of fortune extinguish it!

The return to Melissus here is marked by setting his name in the same emphatic position which it had occupied in the second line of the ode[1]. That line began with

ὦ Μέλισσ',

and the 2nd line of the 3rd antistrophos begins with

καὶ Μελίσσῳ.

And the idea expressed in these two passages is the same. The *light of a hymn* illumines the family of Melissus, and the good fortune is due to Melissus.

ll. 2, 3 ὦ Μέλισσ', εὐμαχανίαν γὰρ ἔφανας Ἰσθμίοις
ὑμετέρας ἀρετὰς ὕμνῳ διώκειν[2].
ll. 43, 44 προφρόνων Μοισᾶν τύχοιμεν κεῖνον ἅψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνων
καὶ Μελίσσῳ.

Pindar's hymn will be a torch for the Cleonymids, though, until Melissus came, they were, like Ajax, unsuccessful; even as Homer's verse spread the ἀρετά of that hero. Compare ἀρετάς (l. 3) of the Cleonymids celebrated by Pindar, with ἀρετάν, l. 38 of Ajax, celebrated by Homer. Fortune has changed; this family are no longer doomed to darkness:

l. 31 ἔστιν δ' ἀφάνεια τύχας.
l. 43 προφρόνων Μοισᾶν τύχοιμεν κ.τ.λ.

The hymn to Melissus is their light (ἔφανας).

And they not only shine, but they shine for ever; they have won immortality:

40 τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἕρπει
εἴ τις εὖ εἴπῃ τι.

And this explains the point (hitherto rather obscure) of that curious expression in the early line of the ode, which represents the Cleonymids as walking, in the flower of their excellences, through life to death:

l. 4 αἰσι Κλεωνυμίδαι θάλλοντες αἰεὶ
σὺν θεῷ θνατὸν διέρχονται βιότου τέλος.

[1] This was observed by Mezger.

[2] There is an almost exact metrical responsion to ὕμνῳ (appreciated by Mezger) in v. 21:
τόνδε πορὼν γενεᾷ θαυμαστὸν ὕμνον.

This expression becomes full of meaning when we put it side by side with l. 40. Before the victory of Melissus, before the hymn of Pindar, the τέλος of the Cleonymids was *death;* now, through the son of Telesiades (ἔρνεϊ Τελεσιάδα l. 45) they have won the τέλος ἄκρον (l. 32), *deathless* fame. Once more,

ἀκτὶς καλῶν ἄσβεστος αἰεί

echoes αἰεί in l. 4. They have *ever* bloomed—in obscurity; now they will for *ever* shine.

And all this is due to Melissus and his pancration crown. For he is not a man, like Ajax, of strength only. He is bold as a lion, but he is also artful as the fox, which can foil the attack of the eagle. The eagle (αἰετός) is typical of Ajax (as so often in Pindar); the fox naturally suggests Odysseus. Melissus has the qualities of both heroes. And the wiles of the fox are not to be deprecated:

χρὴ δὲ πᾶν ἔρδοντ' ἀμαυρῶσαι τὸν ἐχθρόν,—

'all is fair in war'. And Melissus could not afford to despise the aid of art; for, though wiry, he was of small stature.

In this he was like the man of Thebes—his own Thebes—who once on a time came to the house of Antaeus in Libya, to put an end to the savage practice of slaying strangers and roofing a temple of Poseidon with their skulls. This man was no other than the son of Alcmena, Heracles himself; who having explored earth and ocean ascended to Olympus and wedded Hebe.

The tradition that Heracles was a man of small stature is interesting. This external resemblance to Melissus is used by the poet as an occasion for introducing the great hero of Thebes with a view to an ulterior and more important comparison. The adventure with Antaeus is fitly chosen, as the victory of a small man over a giant,—illustrating the victory of Melissus in the pancration. In another respect too, the strifes of the mythical and the historical Theban were alike; both were connected with the worship of Poseidon[1].

But the points of likeness between Heracles and Melissus, which Pindar has most at heart, are suggested in the fourth strophe and antistrophos. (1) In the strophe he describes the immortality won by Heracles, and the application is that Melissus will enjoy an immortality too,—the immortality conferred by song. This application is marked by signals. (*a*) The man who went up to Olympus explored in his labours earth and sea:

l. 55 γαίας τε πάσας
καὶ βαθυκρήμνου πολιᾶς ἁλὸς ἐξευρὼν θέναρ

at the beginning of the fourth strophe. At the beginning of the second

[1] Heracles' object in this labour was to protect the ξένοι and to purify the temple of Poseidon. Melissus was a Cleonymid and they were good πρόξενοι (l. 8), and, unlike Antaeus, κελαδεννᾶς ὀρφανοὶ ὕβριος.

strophe, the scene of the exploits of the man who has now won the immortalizing hymn is thus described:

l. 20 ὁ κινητὴρ δὲ γᾶς Ὀγχηστὸν οἰκέων
καὶ γέφυραν ποντιάδα πρὸ Κορίνθου τειχέων.

(*b*) Heracles was *honoured* by the *immortals*, of whom he became one, even as Ajax was *honoured* by Homer, whose verse can bestow *immortality;* and as Melissus (it is implied) is honoured by this hymn. Compare l. 59 τετίμαται πρὸς ἀθανάτων with l. 37 τετίμακεν and l. 40 ἀθάνατον. (*c*) Land and sea witnessed the works of Heracles, who then was transported to Olympus; even so land and sea witness the light of all noble works (like those of Melissus) immortalized by a hymn.

l. 55 ὃς Οὐλυμπόνδ' ἔβα γαίας τε πάσας
καὶ βαθυκρήμνου πολιᾶς ἁλὸς ἐξευρὼν θέναρ.

l. 41 καὶ πάγκαρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βέβακεν
ἐργμάτων ἀκτὶς κ.τ.λ.

(*d*) As Melissus and (through him) his kindred have reached the proverbial pillars of Heracles, so Heracles himself won the daughter of Hera. Compare the last line of strophe 4 with the last line of antistrophos 1:

60 χρυσέων οἴκων ἄναξ καὶ γαμβρὸς Ἥρας.
12 οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἅπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις.

(2) In the fourth antistrophos a picture is given of the festival which was celebrated every year near the Electra gate of Thebes in honour of Heracles and the children of him and Megara. There were eight altars, one for each of the children who were slain, and fires blazed to heaven throughout a whole night. On the second day games were held; and at these Melissus had won the wreath of white myrtle three times, once as a boy, twice as a man.

The reference to the children of Heracles has its special application to the case of Melissus. The greatness of Heracles has secured this yearly commemoration for them. Even so the deeds of Melissus have secured immortality for the memory of those four kinsmen of his who fell in war. As the warrior children of Heracles have a share in his festival, the warrior kinsfolk of Melissus have a share in his hymn.

χαλκοαρᾶν ὀκτὼ θανόντων (l. 63)

echoes χαλκέῳ τ' Ἄρει ἅδον (l. 15). The eight warriors of ancient days enjoy a yearly blaze of light: ἔμπυρα (63) and φλὸξ ἀνατελλομένα συνεχὲς (65); just as the four warriors of yesterday are lit by a torch of song, πυρσὸν ὕμνων (43), and ἀκτὶς ἄσβεστος (42). That ἔμπυρα and πυρσὸν ὕμνων are meant to signal one to the other is shewn by a second pair of signals in the same contexts (second verse of antistrophos 3 and antistrophos 4):

προφρόνων Μοισᾶν τύχοιμεν κεῖνον ἅψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνων.
44 καὶ Μελίσσῳ παγκρατίου στεφάνωμ' ἐπάξιον.
62 καὶ νεόδματα στεφανώματα βωμῶν αὔξομεν.

Here there is, partially, a metrical responsion; and the signalling is facilitated by the strange and striking character of the phrases πυρσὸν ὕμνων and

*στεφανώματα βωμῶν.* The Cleonymids have obtained the fire of song and a wreath of praise, even as the Heraclids have obtained wreaths of altars and the fire of sacrifice.

The word *παννυχίζει*, applied to the sacrificial flames of this pervigilium, has its significance as a signal. It indicates the contrast intended between Heracles, whose light shines all night, and Ajax who went out in the dark. Ajax is said to have slain himself *ὀψίᾳ ἐν νυκτί* (l. 36). Obscurity, 'death' in the late night, might have been the fate of the Cleonymids but for the prowess of Melissus.

## III. A.

The Isthmian victory of Melissus was followed, probably at no long interval, possibly in the next year, by a victory at Nemea. And the new victory was perhaps almost as welcome. If it had not the charm of being the first, it had a compensating advantage. For the crown which Melissus won 'in the vale of the deep-chested lion' was due to his steeds and not, like that on the Isthmus, to his sinews. A victory in the chariot race[1] was held of more account than a prize for personal strength, and it was for such a victory that the Cleonymids had long been striving in vain. Pindar was again called upon by Melissus for a poem,—not for a long ode like that which he had composed for the former occasion, but for a few verses to celebrate the new success which had been vouchsafed by Zeus.

But instead of supplying a new hymn of short compass Pindar preferred to add a new system to the Isthmian ode—a preface, as it were, bringing it 'up to date'. The result was an ode of really imposing length, of which Melissus, hearing it performed at his feast, might have well been proud.

The composition, which I have numbered III. A, might be called a Nemean proem to an Isthmian hymn[2]. Its occasion was the Nemean victory; yet it is so framed as to seem a suitable introduction to the ode composed for the Isthmian victory. In fact, if one did not pry closely, one might regard the whole five systems as the outcome of a single inspiration. For Pindar skilfully impressed his new prelude with the tone and thoughts of the old hymn; and there are many verbal resemblances which perform their part in hiding the seam. Among these may be specially mentioned the accurate metrical responsion observed by Mezger (and used by him as an argument for the unity of the five systems):

III. A 13 *ἱπποδρομίᾳ κρατέων· ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετάν.*
III. B 13 *καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν.*

But perhaps another echo (which Mezger has not observed) is more striking

[1] On this principle, odes in honour of such victories, are always placed first in order in our collection of Pindar's Epinicians.

[2] These remarks must be supplemented by the general discussion in *Appendix* D.

(though it is not assisted by metre). The story of Ajax and the Isthmian hymn was introduced by the words,

l. 35 (2nd epode) **ἴστε μὰν Αἴαντος** κ.τ.λ.

In the epode of the proem the same phrase introduces the name of the great ancestor of Melissus, from whom the family derived its name—Cleonymus.

l. 15 (epode) **ἴστε μὰν Κλεωνύμου** κ.τ.λ.

This is significant; for, as we have seen, Ajax was brought in as a parallel to the Cleonymidae.

The last lines of the prelude are a variation on the idea expressed in the first strophe of the hymn, that the breezes which blow across the sea of mortal life veer and vary; with special reference to the history of the Cleonymidae. Thus in III. B it is written:

4 *αἶσι Κλεωνυμίδαι θάλλοντες αἰεὶ*
...... **διέρχονται** *βιότου τέλος.* **ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖος οὖρος**
*πάντας ἀνθρώπους* **ἐπαίσσων** *ἐλαύνει.*

In III. A 17, 18 the same thoughts are expressed in echoing language[1]:

*πλούτου* **διέστειχον** *τετραοριᾶν πόνοις.*
**αἰὼν** *δὲ κυλινδομέναις ἀμέραις* **ἄλλ' ἄλλοτ'** *ἐξάλλαξεν,*

where *κυλινδομέναις* suggests that *αἰών* implies a breath of wind.

The concluding words, *ἄτρωτοί γε μὰν παῖδες θεῶν, howbeit sons of gods are woundproof*, is clearly a reference to Heracles, the counterpart of Melissus in the following hymn. Hitherto the Cleonymids have been of merely mortal quality, doomed to die and be forgotten; but Melissus has achieved a fame, which, borne up by Pindar's song, may defy the wounds of time, even as Heracles for his own person won immortality[2].

[1] The verbal resemblances in these verses have, of course, been often remarked.

[2] The following echoes of thought or language in the prelude may also be noticed:

| III. A. | III. B. |
|---|---|
| 2 *αἰανῇ κόρον.* | 8 *κελαδεννᾶς ὕβριος.* |
| 3 **ἄξιος** *εὐλογίαις μεμῖχθαι* | 44 *στεφάνωμ'* **ἐπάξιον** (i.e. a hymn). |
| ,, *εὐλογίαις* **ἀστῶν** (of Melissus). | 61 *δαῖτα πορσύνοντες* **ἀστοί** (of Heracles). |
| 4, 5, 6 *Ζεῦ*...**θνατοῖς** *ἕπονται* *ἐκ σέθεν*... ...*πάντα χρόνον* **θάλλων** *ὁμιλεῖ.* | 4, 5, 6 **θάλλοντες** *αἰεὶ* *σὺν θεῷ* **θνατὸν** κ.τ.λ. |
| 7 **εὐκλέων δ' ἔργων** *ἄποινα*...**ὑμνῆσαι.** | 21, 23 (**πορών**) **ὕμνον·** (*ἀνάγει φάμαν*) **εὐκλέων ἔργων.** |
| 8 *χρὴ δὲ* **κωμάζοντ'** *ἀγαναῖς* **χαρίτεσσιν** *βαστάσαι.* | 72 **κωμάξομαι** *τερπνὰν ἐπιστάζων* **χάριν.** |
| 12 *ἐν* **βαθυστέρνου** *νάπᾳ* (place of the exploit of Melissus). | 56 *καὶ* **βαθυκρήμνου** (*ἁλός*) (scene of exploits of Heracles). |
| 16 (*Κλεωνύμου*) **δόξαν** | 11 *ἀπλέτου* **δόξας** (of the Cleonymids). |
| ,, (*δόξαν*) **παλαιὰν** *ἅρμασιν.* | 22 *φάμαν* **παλαιάν** (ditto). |

The correspondence of *σὺν θεῷ* and *ἐκ σέθεν* was noticed by Mezger.

## METRICAL ANALYSIS.

(*Rhythm: dactyloepitritic.*)

### STROPHE.

–⏑–⏒–⏑–⏒–⏑–––⏑–⏒<br>
–⏑–––⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏒–⏑⏓.<br>
–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–––⏑–⏓<br>
–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–––⏑–⏓<br>
5 –⏑–––⏑–––⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–.–⏑–⏓<br>
–⏑–––⏑–––⏑–⏓

According to M. Schmidt this strophe is bipartite in construction, the point of division falling at the end of *v.* 3, where he assumes a pause of double time (equivalent to two feet). He also assumes two trisemoi after the first two dactyls in *v.* 4, and thus assigns to each half of the strophe, 22 feet.

### EPODE.

–|–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–––⏑⏑⏓.<br>
–⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏒<br>
–⏑–⏒–⏑⏒<br>
––⏑–⏑–⏑–<br>
5 ––⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏒–⏑–––⏑–––⏑–⏒–⏑–<br>
––⏑⏑–⏑⏑–.–⏑–⏓–⏑–––⏑–––⏑⏑⏑––⏑⏒

M. Schmidt gives an epodic scheme. Thus

A (*vv.* 1—3)=(11+4=) 15 feet<br>
A′ (*vv.* 4, 5)=(4+11=) 15 feet<br>
B (*v.* 6)=13 feet.

He regards the anacrusis of *v.* 1 as 'λέξις eines Doppeltakts'; or in plain language, as measuring the time of two feet.

## [ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙ] Γ' (*a*).

# ΜΕΛΙΣΣΩι ΘΗΒΑΙΩι

### ΙΠΠΟΙΣ.

Εἴ τις ἀνδρῶν εὐτυχήσαις ἢ σὺν εὐδόξοις ἀέθλοις  στρ.
ἢ σθένει πλούτου κατέχει φρασὶν αἰανῆ κόρον,

1. **εἴ τις** κ.τ.λ.] 'If a man among men, having met with success by the winning either of glorious prizes or of mightiness of wealth, suppress vast insolence in the depths of his soul, worthy is he to be crowned by the laudations of the citizens'.

For **εὐτυχήσαις σὺν εὐδόξοις** ἀέθλοις cp. *Nem.* I. 10

ἔστι δ' ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ
πανδοξίας ἄκρον.

The success of the man consists in the fact that prizes or wealth accompany him on his way. What accompanies is often an aid, and thus **σύν** sometimes approaches an instrumental meaning; but there is always a shade of difference. For example, *Pyth.* IV. 221 σὺν δ' ἐλαίῳ φαρμακώσαισ' ἀντίτομ' ('with olive oil in her hands'); *Pyth.* XII. 21 σὺν ἔντεσι μιμήσαιτ' ἐρικλάγκταν γόον (not the same as ἔντεσι, but 'with the instruments in the hand'). In *Pyth.* IX. 15 σὺν δ' ἀέθλοις ἐκέλευσεν διακρῖναι ποδῶν, the effect of the preposition is to represent the footrace as an attendant circumstance, as well as a decisive test. In *Nem.* X. 48 (χαλκὸν) ὄντε Κλείτωρ καὶ Τεγέα—θῆκε —σὺν ποδῶν χειρῶν τε νικᾶσαι σθένει, the preposition is an important element in the phrase; σὺν σθένει is not the same as σθένει. There is no expressed subject of νικᾶσαι and σύν helps to supply the want by suggesting 'those who have strength, men with strength'. The attendant suggests the attended more directly than the instrument its wielder. Still more clearly in the present case σύν defines attendant circumstances. We may compare σὺν εὐδόξοις ἀέθλοις on the one hand with *Nem.* X. 48, and on the other with *Nem.* X. 43 σὺν οἰνηραῖς φιάλαις ἀπέβαν. Compare *Isth.* VI. 20.

2. **σθένει πλούτου**] Not the same as πλούτου ἀφθονίᾳ, but 'mighty wealth', referring to the power which wealth bestows. Cp. Euripides' τοῖσι χρήμασι σθένων (*Electra* 939), and *Pyth.* V. 1 ὁ πλοῦτος εὐρυσθενής. So in *Ol.* IX. 51 ὕδατος σθένος is not merely *vis aquae*, but *mighty water* (which of course implies abundance), and the same principle applies to *frag.* 107, 11 νιφετοῦ σθένος ὑπέρφατον, σθένος in all cases suggesting not quantity but power.—**κατέχω**, *keep down*, here figuratively but literally, of a sword

*ἄξιος εὐλογίαις ἀστῶν μεμῖχθαι.*
*Ζεῦ, μεγάλαι δ' ἀρεταὶ θνατοῖς ἕπονται*
*ἐκ σέθεν· ζώει δὲ μάσσων ὄλβος ὀπιζομένων, πλαγίαις δὲ φρένεσσιν* 5
*οὐχ ὁμῶς πάντα χρόνον θάλλων ὁμιλεῖ.*

*εὐκλέων δ' ἔργων ἄποινα χρὴ μὲν ὑμνῆσαι τὸν ἐσλόν,* *ἀντ.*
*χρὴ δὲ κωμάζοντ' ἀγαναῖς χαρίτεσσιν βαστάσαι.*

in a scabbard, *Nem.* x. 6 *ἐν κουλεῷ κατασχοῖσα ξίφος.*—**αἰανῆ κόρον**, *ravening insolence*, occurs also in *Pyth.* I. 83. For *αἰανής* see note on *Isth.* I. 49. *κόρος* is due to the 'satiety' resulting from *εὐτυχία.*

3. **μεμῖχθαι**] Compare *Nem.* IX. 31 *ἀγλαΐαισιν δ' ἀστυνόμοις ἐπιμῖξαι λαόν*, *Nem.* I. 18. For **εὐλογίαις** see *Isth.* V. 21. In *Nem.* IV. 5 *εὐλογία* is called *φόρμιγγι συνάορος.*

4. **Ζεῦ κ.τ.λ.**] *But when great excellences attend mortals on their way, 'tis thou O Zeus who sendest them.* **ἐκ σέθεν**, at the beginning of l. 5, is the emphatic word of the sentence. **ἀρεταί**, such as *εὔδοξα ἄεθλα* and *σθένος πλούτου.*

5. **ζώει κ.τ.λ.**] *But the weal of men who fear the gods has a larger life.*—**ζώει**, cp. *ῥῆμα δ' ἐργμάτων χρονιώτερον βιοτεύει.* Pindar does not use the form *ζάω.*—**μάσσων**, that is *ἢ τῶν μὴ ὀπιζομένων* (who are characterized in the next clause). As Dissen well observes, the comparative is more 'modest' than the positive would be.—**ὀπιζομένων**, here means *τῶν Δία ὀπιζομένων*, those who have the fitting religious feelings towards Zeus, from whom come *μεγάλαι ἀρεταί. ὀπιζόμενος* is perhaps the nearest equivalent we can get for 'religious'. *ὄπις* is care and respect for sacred things. The participle occurs also in *Pyth.* IV. 86, and II. 17.—**πλαγίαις φρένεσσιν**, referring to **φρασὶν** *αἰανῆ* **κόρον** just mentioned. Cp. *Nem.* I. 64 *καί τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα.* It is to be observed that *φρασί* is the regular dative of *φρένες* in Pindar, and that *φρένεσσι* here is exceptional (cp. *ποσί, πόδεσσι* &c.). I incline to think that it carried to a Greek ear a modulation of meaning slightly different from that of *φρασί.* Did it suggest the thoughts which constitute the mind rather than the mind itself conceived as a unity? Or, whereas *φρασί* is so often equivalent to *φρενί* (the mind of one person), did *φρένεσσι* define more unequivocally a true plural 'the minds of a number of men', namely *τῶν μὴ ὀπιζομένων*? Or are such differentiations too subtle, and is *φρένεσσι* used just as a modern English poet might now and again use 'eyne'?—As Pindar doubtless associated *ὀπίζομαι* with *ὄψομαι* and its cognates (cp. *Isth.* IV. 58 and note), it is possible that *πλαγίαις* may convey the special suggestion of *looking* sideways *askance.*—Observe that **δέ** is lengthened here before *φρ.*

6. **οὐχ ὁμῶς**] Understand *καὶ φρένεσσιν ὀπιζομένων. οὐχ ὁμῶς* is to be connected closely with **πάντᾱ χρόνον** (cp. *ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ Ol.* VI. 36; equivalent to *τὸν πάντα χρόνον*) in the sense 'only for a brief time'.—**θάλλων ὁμιλεῖ** must be taken closely together, being roughly equivalent to *συνθάλλει* (were there such a word). For *θάλλω* with *ὄλβος* cp. *frag.* 129, 5 *παρὰ δέ σφισιν εὐανθὴς ἅπας τέθαλεν ὄλβος*, *Pyth.* VII. 21 *θάλλοισαν εὐδαιμονίαν.* We may render: *But not like these for all time do crooked souls walk with happiness in her blooming ways.*

7, 8. **ἄποινα**] *As a price for noble deeds*, almost with the force of a preposition like *χάριν*, but strictly explicable as

*ἔστι δὲ καὶ διδύμων ἀέθλων Μελίσσῳ*
*μοῖρα πρὸς εὐφροσύναν τρέψαι γλυκεῖαν* 10
*ἦτορ, ἐν βάσσαισιν Ἰσθμοῦ δεξαμένῳ στεφάνους, τὰ δὲ κοίλᾳ λέοντος*
*ἐν βαθυστέρνου νάπᾳ κάρυξε Θήβαν*

*ἱπποδρομίᾳ κρατέων. ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετὰν* *ἐπ.*

apposed to ὕμνον, the unexpressed cognate object of ὑμνῆσαι. For this meaning of **ἄποινα** cp. *Isth.* VII. 3, *Nem.* VII. 15, but the flavour of the word is lost by any weaker rendering (e.g. 'meed') than *price*. **εὐκλέων ἔργων** takes up εὐδόξοις ἀέθλοις (l. 1).—For **χρὴ μὲν** corresponding to **χρὴ δέ**, where two aspects of the same thing, or two parts of the same process, or two things closely related, are enumerated, compare *Nem.* XI. 3 *sqq.*

> **εὖ μὲν** Ἀρισταγόραν δέξαι τεὸν ἐς θάλαμον
> **εὖ δ'** ἑταίρους ἀγλαῷ σκάπτῳ πέλας
> οἵ σε γεραίροντες ὀρθὰν φυλάσσοισιν Τένεδον,
> **πολλὰ μὲν** λοιβαῖσιν ἀγαζόμενοι πρώταν θεῶν
> **πολλὰ δὲ** κνίσᾳ.

This idiom of style is not infrequent in Pindar; cp. below *Isth.* IV. 30. Our corresponding idiom is 'yea' with the second clause: 'It is meet to sing the brave, yea, meet is it to sustain him aloft in the kômos with the gentle hands of the graces'.—**τὸν ἐσλόν**, object of ὑμνῆσαι, but in the next verse κωμάζοντ' agrees with the subject of βαστάσαι (namely the poet and the singers of the kômos). For **βαστάσαι** cp. note on *Nem.* VIII. 3; and *Ol.* XII. 19 where Ergoteles is said 'to bear up' his native city Himera by his victories (θερμὰ Νυμφᾶν λουτρὰ βαστάζεις).—Commentators explain **χαρίτεσσιν** as *hymns* (cp. *Isth.* I. 6) and of course hymns are referred to; yet it is not synonymous with ἀοιδαῖς. The figure suggested is the victor sustained in the air by the Charites themselves.

9. **ἔστι** κ.τ.λ.] *But Melissus has the portion of two prizes* (*no less!*) *to turn his soul to sweet Euphrosyne, for in the dells of Isthmus he received crowns, and also in the valley-glade of the deep-chested lion he proclaimed the name of Theba for victory in a race of steeds.*—**καὶ διδύμων**, 'not one only but a pair', 'no less than two'. The scholiast understood that both victories were gained in ἱπποδρομία (p. 379): ταῦτα οὖν λέγει ὡς καὶ Ἴσθμια καὶ Νέμεα νενικηκότος αὐτοῦ ἱπποδρομίᾳ. But the Isthmian victory meant is clearly that of the pancration; observe the change of construction.—**ἀέθλων**, scan as a dissyllable.

10. **πρός**] cp. πρὸς Ἀσυχίαν τετραμμένον *Ol.* IV. 18, τρέψαι ποτὶ στίχας *Nem.* IX. 38.

11. **βάσσαισιν**] of the vale of Olympia, *Ol.* II. 23. τὰ μὲν is understood with ἐν βάσσαισιν to correspond to **τὰ δέ** (= 'on the other hand'), for which, placed thus absolutely, cp. *Ol.* IX. 95 τὰ δὲ Παρρασίῳ στρατῷ θαυμαστὸς ἐὼν φάνη.

12. **βαθυστέρνου**] Bergk's βαθυστέρνῳ is perverse. ἐν βαθυστέρνῳ νάπᾳ (as the scholiast *interprets*) may be meant, if we push the phrase into prose. The epithet is applied to the Earth, when she swallowed Amphitryon, in *Nem.* IX. 25. **νάπᾳ**, of the Napa at Delphi, *Pyth.* VI. 9; νάπος of Isthmus *Isth.* VII. 63.—**κάρυξε** (cp. above III. 25) **Θήβαν**, as the city of the victor.

13. **ἱπποδρομίᾳ**] The ancients felt a doubt whether these victories were κέλητι ἢ τεθρίππῳ, in horse races or in chariot races (see schol., Abel p. 397). Several

σύμφυτον οὐ κατελέγχει.
ἴστε μὰν Κλεωνύμου 15
δόξαν παλαιὰν ἅρμασιν·
καὶ ματρόθε Λαβδακίδαισιν σύννομοι πλούτου διέστειχον τε-
τραοριᾶν πόνοις.

considerations concur to shew that chariot races are meant. (1) This is naturally suggested by l. 16 ἅρμασιν, and (2) by III. B 25, 29, which proves that the Cleonymidae were accustomed to enter their *chariots* at the great games. (3) ἱπποδρομία refers to chariot racing where it occurs elsewhere in Pindar, *Pyth.* IV. 67, and similarly ἱπποδρόμιος in *Isth.* I. 54.

· **ἀνδρῶν δ'**] *No* (**δέ**), *he doth not disgrace the manlihood inherited from his fathers.* **σύμφυτον** *inbred* (only here in Pindar) shews what ἄνδρες are meant. For **κατελέγχει** cp. *Isth.* VII. 65. **ἀρετάν** answers the last word of III. B 13, and σύμφυτον perhaps signals to φύσιν in III. B 49 (3rd epode).

15, 16. **ἴστε μάν**] Echoes ἴστε μάν in III. B 35 (second epode), and **Κλεωνύμου δόξαν παλαιάν** echoes **φάμαν παλαιὰν εὐκλέων** ἔργων III. B 22.—**ἅρμασιν**, dative of the instrument whereby the fame was won; like ἵπποισι νίκαν *Isth.* II. 13.

17. **ματρόθε**] The wife of Cleonymus was a Labdacid. **καί**, *moreover.* **Λαβδακίδαισιν σύννομοι**, (more than *allied with*) *associated with the Labdacidae.* **σύννομος** means 'having the same range or sphere as', partner, joint-heir, mate; often of animals which herd together. The word is common; but is not found elsewhere in Pindar.—**πλούτου διέστειχον** (MSS. διέστιχον, ει being often written ι in MSS.), *walked in the ways of wealth*, like διέρχονται βιότου (of which this phrase is an echo) in III. B 5. So Dissen and most commentators explain, rightly as it seems to me, but Mr Fennell takes διέστειχον absolutely 'they walked consistently', and πλούτου with σύννομοι, for which he cites Liddell and Scott. But the Lexicon is inconsistent; for, while under σύννομος his view is given, under διαστείχω, πλούτου is connected with the verb. It seems to me that we should do ill to narrow the sense of σύννομοι by construing it with πλούτου, and that the meaning assigned by Mr Fennell to διέστειχον is extremely doubtful. We must remember that διέρχομαι (apart from III. B 5, where my view differs from that of Mr Fennell) is never used absolutely except (1) where it means 'to come to an end', of time, and (2) where διά has the force of Latin *dis-*, in different directions (in Theocritus XXVII. 68, διέστιχε=*discessit*). And we are bound to judge the rare διαστείχω by the usage of the *exemplar* διέρχομαι.

**πόνοις**] Dative of manner, according to Mr Fennell, who takes it with διέστειχον. It is rather dative of sphere, and should be taken with σύννομοι.—For **τετρᾱορ̄ιᾶν** cp. *Ol.* II. 5, for τετρᾱορία, *Nem.* IV. 28. For the quantity τέτρᾱορος see *Nem.* VII. 93.

We may render the whole sense thus:

*Moreover, through their mother akin to the Labdacids, they walked with them in the ways of wealth, their associates in the labours of the four-horsed chariots.*

18. **αἰὼν δέ** κ.τ.λ.] An echo of III. B 5, 6.—*But the blast of time causeth divers heavy* (ἐξ-) *changes at various times to the days of life's rolling sea.* Commentators have missed the figure, a wind ruffling the sea, as three considerations shew; (1) κυλινδομέναις, cp. *Ol.* XII. 6, (2) αἰών, connected with ἄημι, cp. my note on *Nem.* II. 8; (3) these words are an echo of III. B 5, ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖος **οὖρος—ἐπαΐσσων.** We are reminded of Swinburne's line 'And time is as wind and as waves are we'. Cp. also *Isth.* VII. 14, 15, where

*αἰὼν δὲ κυλινδομέναις ἁμέραις ἄλλ' ἄλλοτ' ἐξάλλαξεν· ἄτρωτοι γε μὰν παῖδες θεῶν.*

*αἰών* is described as *ἑλίσσων βίου πόρον*.—**ἁμέραις**, dative, as the changes concern the days.

**ἄτρωτοι**] *Howbeit, sons of the gods are wound-proof.* The point of the reflexion lies in what is implied rather than in what is said. The gods *alone* can take no hurt; in that they are distinguished from mortals. A mortal man must be content, if he is *εὐδαίμων*, like Melissus; it would be irrational to repine that he is not *ἄτρωτος*. (See *Introduction*.) The same thought is stated directly in *Pyth.* VII. 16 *sqq.*, where **γε μάν** plays a similar part.

*τὸ δ' ἄχνυμαι*
*φθόνον ἀμειβόμενον τὰ καλὰ Ϝέργα.*
*φαντί* **γε μὰν** *οὕτω κεν ἀνδρὶ παρμονίμαν*
*θάλλοισαν εὐδαιμονίαν*
*τὰ καὶ τὰ φέρεσθαι.*

'I am distressed that you are assaulted by envy. Yet, though it may distress us, do not forget that memorable saying, that the most abiding happiness is not unmixed'. This parallel passage suggests strongly that the special application of the words before us, as addressed to Melissus, concerned envy and ill-will to which his family was exposed. This is confirmed, I think, by the use of *ἄτρωτοι*. For *ἄτρωτος* occurs in one other passage in Pindar, *Nem.* XI. 10, where a wish is expressed that Aristagoras may pass through his year of office *σὺν ἀτρώτῳ κραδίᾳ*. Comparing these two passages, may we not suspect that *ἄτρωτος* suggested especially *unwounded by missiles of envy?* (cp. *Ol.* VIII. 55, where envy is conceived as stoning, *μὴ βαλέτω με λίθῳ τραχεῖ φθόνος*).—For **γε μάν** cf. *Nem.* VIII. 50 (note); *Ol.* XIII. 104, *νῦν δ' ἔλπομαι μέν· ἐν θεῷ γε μὰν τέλος· εἰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.* 'Howbeit, whatever my hopes be, the end lies with the god'; *Pyth.* I. 50 *νῦν γε μάν* 'now, whatever were the events of the past' (cp. l. 17).—**παῖδες θεῶν**, *heroes* schol. *ἀντὶ τοῦ οἱ θεοί, ὡς καὶ παῖδες Ἑλλήνων οἱ Ἕλληνες.* Cp. Plato, *Laws*, 909 E, and *Cratylus* 398.

# ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙ Γ' (β).

## ΜΕΛΙΣΣΩι ΘΗΒΑΙΩι

### ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙΩι.

Ἔστι μοι θεῶν ἕκατι μυρία παντᾷ κέλευθος, στρ. α'.
ὦ Μέλισσ', εὐμαχανίαν γὰρ ἔφανας Ἰσθμίοις
ὑμετέρας ἀρετὰς ὕμνῳ διώκειν·

1. **ἔστι μοι** κ.τ.λ.] *I have by favour of gods a million ways to choose from, wherever I turn;* that is, a million roads of song, countless themes for praise. The ground for this statement is given in the next line. We meet the same figure in *Isth.* V. 22, expressed partly in the same language, but with more particularity:

μυρίαι δ' ἔργων καλῶν τέτμηνθ' ἑκατόμπεδοι ἐν σχερῷ κέλευθοι κ.τ.λ.

Compare also *Nem.* VI. 45 πλατεῖαι πάντοθεν...πρόσοδοι.—For the singular **μυρία κέλευθος**, *many and many a way*, compare the ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα of Aeschylus. **παντᾷ** (al. παντᾶ), in every direction, *quoquoversus.*

2, 3. **εὐμαχανίαν** κ.τ.λ.] *For at the Isthmian games, O Melissus, you gave a bright abundant opportunity for a poet to chase in song the excellence of your race.*—**εὐμαχανία**, *opportunitas* (only here in Pindar). εὐμήχανος is the Greek for 'ingenious', or 'full of resources'; εὐμαχανία here means abundance of material. The opposite is ἀμαχανία which Pindar seems to associate with darkness (if the Fifth Olympian be genuine, l. 14 ἀπ' ἀμαχανίας ἄγων ἐς φάος), as here εὐμαχανία with light (ἔφανας). The opposite of εὐμαχανίαν ὕμνῳ διώκειν is σιγαλὸν ἀμαχανίαν, *Pyth.* IX. 92.—For **Ἰσθμίοις** (nom. Ἴσθμια, *the Isthmian games*) without the preposition (we have ἐν Πυθίοις and ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις) compare *Nem.* V. 5 Νεμείοις. **ὑμετέρας** 'of you and your family'. So in *Pyth.* VIII. 72, Ξέναρκες ὑμετέραις τύχαις, cp. *Nem.* X. 37. For **διώκειν** in figurative use cp. *Isth.* V. 71; *Ol.* III. 45 οὐ μὴ διώξω (τὸ πόρσω). Its appropriateness here has not been generally perceived. The poet imagines that he is literally pursuing the brave qualities of the Cleonymidae along roads (κέλευθος l. 1).—**ἔφανας** is the correction of Triclinian ε. The other MSS. have ἔφανες. The words Ἰσθμίοις ὑμετέρας have been preserved by B. In D they are omitted.

Observe that **ὦ Μέλισσ'** responds to **καὶ Μελίσσῳ** l. 44 and that **ὕμνῳ** is answered by **ὕμνον** in l. 21 (Mezger).

*αἷσι Κλεωνυμίδαι θάλλοντες αἰεὶ*
*σὺν θεῷ θνατὸν διέρχονται βιότου τέλος. ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖος οὖρος* 5
*πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπαΐσσων ἐλαύνει.*

*τοὶ μὲν ὦν Θήβαισι τιμάεντες ἀρχᾶθεν λέγονται* ἀντ. α'.
*πρόξενοί τ' ἀμφικτιόνων κελαδεννᾶς τ' ὀρφανοὶ*
*ὕβριος· ὅσσα δ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἄηται*

4. **αἷσι** κ.τ.λ.] *Whereby the Cleonymidae ever fair and blooming with the god's favour pass through life to the mortal end.* **αἷσι** defines **θάλλοντες**. The general term θεός often occurs (without article) in Pindar (e.g. *Pyth.* II. 49 and 88, *Ol.* XIII. 104). We have σὺν θεῷ in *Nem.* VIII. 17. **θνατὸν τέλος**, *mortal end*, that is 'death', is the Homeric phrase τέλος θανάτοιο transformed. It is an 'accusativus termini' (so Mezger and Rumpel), and βιότου depends on δι-έρχονται (cp. πλούτου δι-έστειχον, III. A 17). Other editors make θνατὸν βιότου τέλος mean 'the span of mortal life', and construct διέρχονται with an accusative. But βιότου τέλος would naturally mean the end or accomplishment of life, not life itself. ἔρχομαι is constantly used with an accusative of place by Pindar; see above, note on *Isth.* II. 48.—Observe that **τέλος** recurs in the same foot of the corresponding line of the first antistrophos (l. 11). **βιότου** was restored by Donaldson for MSS. βίου.

6. **ἐπαΐσσων**] *rushing down on them; ingruens.* Used of the wind also in Homer, B 146. **ἀνθρώπους** depends on ἐλαύνει. *At divers times divers winds rushing on drive all men before them.* **πάντας** is emphatic; none are excepted. This general statement prepares the way for the sad event mentioned in l. 17. Compare the echo in the concluding verse of III. A. See also *Pyth.* III. 104

ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖαι πνοαὶ
ὑψιπετᾶν ἀνέμων.

7. **τοὶ μὲν ὦν**] For **μὲν ὦν** cp. *Pyth.* III. 82, τὰ μὲν ὦν οὐ δύνανται νήπιοι κόσμῳ φέρειν, to which answers l. 84 τὶν δὲ μοῖρ' εὐδαιμονίας ἕπεται.—According to Mr Fennell **μὲν** is taken up by ἀλλά in l. 34. I do not think so. It seems clear that μέν is answered regularly by **δὲ** in l. 18

**νῦν δ' αὖ** μετὰ χειμέριον κ.τ.λ.

νῦν is opposed to **ἀρχᾶθεν**. And Mr Fennell's own note helps to support this view. He cites two instances of μὲν οὖν: (1) Lysias, *pro Callia*, ἐνόμιζον μὲν οὖν—νῦν δέ, (2) Thucydides, I. 71, μέχρι μὲν οὖν τοῦδε—νῦν δέ. In both these cases μὲν οὖν is followed by νῦν δέ.—**Θήβαισι**, locative. **τιμάεντες** (only here in Pindar; τιμῆς [doubtful in *Iliad*, I. 605, where Professor Jebb proposes ὁμῆς τιμῆς; but τιμῆντα in Σ 475], τιμηέστερος, τιμηέστατος in Homer) is predicate with λέγονται. **ἀρχᾶθεν** (also in *Ol.* IX. 55) *from the beginning*, 'from the earliest times', ἄνωθεν. To **τιμάεντες** responds **τετίμακεν** l. 37 (a responsion unnoticed by Mezger).

8. **ἀμφικτιόνων**] The neighbouring inhabitants of Boeotia (schol. τοῖς περιοίκοις).—**κελαδεννᾶς τ' ὀρφανοὶ ὕβριος**, *and dispossessed of clamorous insolence.* **κελαδεννᾶς** here has much the same force as λάβρος *loud*, *noisy* (cp. my note on *Nem.* VIII. 46). The insolent crows are λάβροι in *Ol.* II. 86. Conversely we might substitute κελαδεννόν, twice used by Pindar in a good sense (*Pyth.* IX. 89 and III. 113) for λάβρον (λίθον) in *Nem.* VIII. 46. —**ὀρφανοί**, generally with genitive of something desirable; so *Ol.* IX. 61 (γενεᾶς), *Isth.* VI. 10 (ἑταίρων). ὀρφανός is the opposite of *possessing*.

9. **ὅσσα δ'** κ.τ.λ.] *And as for all testimonies that are wafted to the lands of men, touching immeasurable Glory won by*

μαρτύρια φθιμένων ζωῶν τε φωτῶν 10
ἀπλέτου δόξας, ἐπέψαυσαν κατὰ πᾶν τέλος· ἀνορέαις δ' ἐσχάταισιν
οἴκοθεν στάλαισιν ἅπτονθ' Ἡρακλείαις,

καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν. ἐπ. α'.

*heroes living and dead*,—*they* (the Cleonymids) *perfected their wooing of her*. For the construction and the sentiment, cp. *Pyth*. X. 28 ὅσαις δὲ βρότεον ἔθνος ἀγλαΐαις ἁπτόμεσθα, περαίνει πρὸς ἔσχατον.—**ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους**, *to men-ward*, *the way of men*. So, in the same connexion, *Ol*. III. 10 θεόμοροι νίσσοντ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἀοιδαί. As ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους is opposed to θεόμοροι there, so here it is contrasted with θεῶν l. 1 and θεῷ l. 5.—**μαρτύρια** and **ἀπλέτου** are ἅπαξ εἰρημένα in Pindar (in *Pyth*. III. 106 ἄπλετος is a highly improbable guess of Hermann). μαρτύρια are the testimonies borne by poets.—ψαύω occurs three times in Pindar; ἐπιψαύω here and *Pyth*. IV. 92 (τᾶν ἐν δυνατῷ φιλοτάτων ἐπιψαύειν ἔραται). The present passage is illustrated by *Nem*. V. 42 ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων, on which I have pointed out that ψαύω suggests amorous touches. Here **ἐπέψαυσαν**, *laid gentle hands on*, though grammatically its object is μαρτυρίων, really applies to **δόξας**, personally conceived. The Cleonymidae wooed Fame and made her their bride; **κατὰ πᾶν τέλος**, *according unto all perfection*, keeps up the figure, suggesting the τέλος γαμήλιον.

11. **ἀνορέαις**] *deeds of manlihood:* occurs in singular in *Isth*. VII. 26.—**ἐσχάταισιν**, they could go no further; the idea is carried out in the next line. We may translate *supreme*, yet that does not quite suggest the figure.

12. **οἴκοθεν**] *without leaving home*, as in *Ol*. III. 44 where we have the same metaphor, and the same words:

νῦν γε πρὸς **ἐσχατιὰν** Θήρων ἀρεταῖσιν ἱκάνων **ἅπτεται**
**οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν.**

In both these passages the force of οἴκοθεν, which moderates and mitigates the strong metaphor, has been misunderstood by commentators. Theron there, the Cleonymidae here, travel to the Pillars of Heracles, yet they never stir from Hellenic soil.—No difference seems to have been made by Pindar between the use of **ἅπτομαι** with the genitive and its use with the dative. We may defy the most penetrating eye to discover a shade of difference between στάλαισιν ἅπτονθ' here and ἅπτεται σταλᾶν in the Third Olympian.

13. **καὶ** κ.τ.λ.] This is generally explained as a sort of parenthetical injunction, addressed to Melissus, σπεύδειν being infinitive for imperative: *ac noli maiorem affectare gloriam* (Dissen). It has been felt however that **καὶ** is awkward and various emendations have been proposed, among which I may mention Bergk's τῷ, and Christ's τᾶν οὐκ ἔνι (accepted by Mezger), both as improbable as Hartung's ὧν μηκέτι μακρότερ' ἦν. Another difficulty has been found in μακροτέραν, which has been explained by some (1) *greater*, cp. μακρὸν ὄλβον *Pyth*. II. 26, μάσσων ὄλβος *Isth*, III. A 5, but (2) by Bulle as the comparative of the adverb μακράν, scil. ὁδόν, which seems to have been the view of the scholiast who wrote ὑπὲρ Ἡρακλείας φησὶ στήλας μὴ δύνασθαι τὴν ἀρετὴν πέμψαι.

None of these explanations recommend themselves. It may be observed, (1) that it is not in Pindar's manner to introduce in the middle of his tale about the Cleonymidae an imperative address, in this parenthetical way; we should expect τὸ πόρσιον δ' οὐκ ἄβατον or something in that form; (2) that it is not probable that Melissus is addressed here; we have left him in the first strophe and he does not

*ἱπποτρόφοι τ' ἐγένοντο,*
*χαλκέῳ τ' Ἄρει Ϝάδον.* 15
*ἀλλ' ἁμέρᾳ γὰρ ἐν μιᾷ*
*τραχεῖα νιφὰς πολέμοιο τεσσάρων ἀνδρῶν ἐρήμωσεν μάκαιραν ἑστίαν·*
*νῦν δ' αὖ μετὰ χειμέριον ποικίλων μηνῶν ζόφον χθὼν ὥτε φοινικέοισιν ἄνθησεν ῥόδοις*

reappear till the third antistrophos; (3) that the introduction of this imperative by *καί* is very awkward, and is not explained by Mr Fennell's 'verily'; (4) that *μακροτέραν* must not be separated from *ἀρετάν*.

It seems to me that if we remove the punctuation after Ἡρακλείαις, all difficulty disappears. **καὶ** links together **οἴκοθεν** and the idea *πρὸς ἐσχατιάν*, here expressed in the form **μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν**. 'They touch the Heraclean Pillars, without leaving home and *in such wise as* (*ὥστε*) to cease from the quest of excellence beyond that goal'. The truth about **μακροτέραν** is partly with Dissen and partly with Bulle. Grammatically it goes with *ἀρετάν*, but its felicity here just lies in the fact that it may mean both (1) *greater*, *ampler*, and (2) *more distant*. The second meaning is appropriate to the figure ('farther than the pillars'), while the first suits the thing figured ('greater excellence than they have attained').

For **σπεύδειν** with accusative cp. *Pyth.* III. 62

*μή, φίλα ψυχά, βίον ἀθάνατον σπεῦδε,*

'speed not in quest of immortal life'.

14, 15. **ἱπποτρόφοι τ'** *κ.τ.λ.*] Observe the absence of a connecting particle; for **τ'** is *both* (not *and*). Compare *Nem.* X. 61, 75; IX. 16. For *ἱπποτρόφος* cp. above, *Isth.* II. 38.—**χαλκέῳ**, Homeric epithet of Ares. Here perhaps it suggests a bronze statue. There is an echo in l. 63 below, **χαλκοαρᾶν**.—The MSS. have *χαλκείῳ*. B alone preserves *τ'*.

16. **ἀλλ' ἁμέρᾳ γάρ**] **ἀλλά—γάρ** introduces a statement in support of an unexpressed but easily understood proposition. The point to be noted is that **ἀλλά** really belongs to the sentence which would have conveyed the unexpressed thought, and **γάρ** to the sentence which implies and supports it. Thus if we regarded the origin of the idiom we should write

ἀλλὰ——· ἁμέρᾳ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.

In the present case the suppressed thought is: 'but it has not always been fair weather; there has been a dark winter too, storms and snow'. For other instances of *ἀλλὰ—γάρ* in Pindar, see *Nem.* VII. 30 (where understand 'men must resign themselves'), *Ol.* VI. 53 (understand 'but they knew it not'), and below, *Isth.* VI. 16. From ἀλλὰ—*γάρ* it was an easy step to *ἀλλὰ γάρ*, for which see *Nem.* VII. 52, *Pyth.* IV. 32 (sc. 'but we declined'), *Ol.* I. 55 (sc. 'but he deserved it not', or 'he was ungrateful').

17. **νιφάς**] Elsewhere Pindar associates war with hail and cloud; cp. *Isth.* VI. 27; *Nem.* IX. 38.—**ἐρήμωσεν** (for *ἠρήμωσεν*); with genitive also *Pyth.* III. 97.

18. **νῦν δ' αὖ** *κ.τ.λ.*] **δ'** takes up **μέν** in l. 7.—**αὖ** *in turn*, after the temporary obscuration, compared to wintry darkness.—Observe the position of *ποικίλων μηνῶν*, which depends on *ζόφον* as well as on *ῥόδοις*. The subject of **ἄνθησεν** is *μάκαιρα ἑστία*: with *ὥτε χθών* understand *ἀνθεῖ*.—**ποικίλων**, *many-coloured;* they bring both winter's darkness and spring's roses. Many editors have assumed that the epithet *ποικίλος*, occurring in this

δαιμόνων βουλαῖς. ὁ κινητὴρ δὲ γᾶς Ὀγχηστὸν οἰκέων   στρ. β'.
καὶ γέφυραν ποντιάδα πρὸ Κορίνθου τειχέων,   20
τόνδε πορὼν γενεᾷ θαυμαστὸν ὕμνον
ἐκ λεχέων ἀνάγει φάμαν παλαιὰν
εὐκλέων ἔργων· ἐν ὕπνῳ γὰρ πέσεν· ἀλλ' ἀνεγειρομένα χρῶτα
λάμπει,
Ἀωσφόρος θαητὸς ὡς ἄστροις ἐν ἄλλοις·

context, must refer to the earth (cp. for example, Bergk *P. L. G.*, *frag. adesp.* 104 A ποικίλλεται μὲν γαῖα πολυστέφανος); hence Hartung's ποικίλα (adopted by Bergk), Rauchenstein's ποικίλως. Kayser proposed φοινίων. These conjectures seem unfortunate.—**φοινικέοισιν** *crimson*, only here in Pindar, but cp. *frag.* 129 φοινικορόδοις δ' ἐνὶ λειμώνεσσι, and *Pyth.* IV. 64 φοινικανθέμου ἦρος (meaning clearly 'roses'). It has been supposed that these ῥόδα are scarlet anemones.—For ἄνθησεν, D has ἄνθος, arising apparently from a wrong division, ἄνθης ἐν ῥόδοις.—Cp. πέλαγος Αἰγαῖον νεκροῖς ἀνθοῦν, Aesch. *Agam.* 659; the sea blossoms—with corpses, in the morning after the storm.

19. **ὁ κινητὴρ δὲ γᾶς**] Equivalent to the epithets σεισίχθων, ἐννοσίγαιος. **κινητήρ** (*Hymn. Hom.* XXI. 2) is ἅπαξ εἰρ. in Pindar. For Poseidon at Onchestus, see above *Isth.* I. 33.

20. **γέφυραν ποντιάδα**] *sea-bridge*, the Isthmus; like πόντου γέφυρ' ἀκάμαντος *bridge of indefatigable ocean*, *Nem.* VI. 39. The feminine adjective ποντιάς, instead of ποντία, occurs also in *Nem.* IV. 36.—**πρό** local, *in front of*, as *Ol.* XIII. 56 πρὸ Δαρδάνου τειχέων, and mostly in Pindar. Except (1) *Isth.* VI. 27 *on behalf of* and (2) *Ol.* X. 23, *Pyth.* IV. 140, =*prae*. Observe that the vowel preceding πρὸ is lengthened, ποντιάδᾱ; so in *Isth.* VII. 13 τὸ δὲ πρὸ ποδός (not so in *Pyth.* V. 96).

21. **πορών**] So B D; other MSS. πορῶν.—Compare *Isth.* I. 61 and II. 18.

22. **ἀνάγει**] *raises up*, transitive to ἀνέρχομαι (cp. ἀνῆλθε φάος, Aesch. *Agam.* 658). In a somewhat similar context *Isth.* V. 62 ἀνὰ δ' ἄγαγον ἐς φάος οἵαν μοῖραν ὕμνων.—ἐκ λεχέων shews that φάμα is personified.

23. **ἐν ὕπνῳ γὰρ πέσεν**] Commentators have missed the meaning of this clause, through not attending to ἐκ λεχέων in the preceding line. The metaphor and the construction are the same as in ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας *Isth.* II. 36 (see note). Phama is conceived as embracing Hypnos. Cp. Eur. *Hel.* 1093 ἢ Διόσιν ἐν λέκτροις πίτνεις. 'She fell on sleep' means 'she fell into the arms of Sleep'. The hymn of victory raises her up from those embraces; she rises from the dark bed and enters into light once more. (Swinburne has 'for youth's high joy, that time has cast on sleep').—For the construction cp. *Isth.* VII. 7. For the figure of a sleep of Fame, cp. *Isth.* VI. 17. **πέσεν** has a pluperfect sense.—**χρῶτα λάμπει** *shineth in her bodily aspect.* **χρῶτα**, meaning external bodily appearance, keeps up the personification of the goddess. λάμπει is intransitive. Cp. *Ol.* I. 23 λάμπει δέ Ϝοι κλέος.—The scholiast cites from Euripides

εὕδουσα δ' Ἰνοῦς συμφορὰ πολὺν χρόνον
νῦν ὄμμ' ἐγείρει

(Nauck, frag. 402).

24. **Ἀωσφόρος**] B ἀωσφόρος, D ἑωσφόρος. Bergk is doubtless right in holding that neither of these forms is Pindaric, and it is very dubious whether ἀωσφόρος is Greek. In any case it seems impossible that ἀωσφόρος could have been scanned as a dactyl. Bergk proposes to restore Ἀοσφόρος, an hypothetical form for which we have no authority. I am inclined to

ἅ τε κὴν γουνοῖς Ἀθανᾶν ἅρμα καρύξαισα νικᾶν ἀντ. β'. 25
ἔν τ' Ἀδραστείοις ἀέθλοις Σικυῶνος ὤπασεν
τοιάδε τῶν τότ' ἐόντων φύλλ' ἀοιδᾶν.
οὐδὲ παναγυρίων ξυνᾶν ἀπεῖχον
καμπύλον δίφρον, Πανελλάνεσσι δ' ἐριζόμενοι δαπάνᾳ χαῖρον
ἵππων.
τῶν ἀπειράτων γὰρ ἄγνωστοι σιωπαί. 30

believe that Ἀσφόρος (cited by Bergk from Cyril and explained as a contraction of ἀεσφόρος) may have been the form used by Pindar. But as we have no data, we can only keep ἀωσφόρος or ἑωσφόρος under protest.

25. **ἅ τε**] *who*, namely Phama.—**κὴν** is preserved by D (B κεὶν), so-called Doric crasis. **καὶ** means as well as the Isthmian victory of Melissus, referred to in ll. 19 sqq.—**ἐν γουνοῖς Ἀθανᾶν** *in the fertile fields of Athens* (in arvis Athenarum). γουνός is not found elsewhere in Pindar. —**νικᾶν**, recognized in one scholium, is certainly right. The MSS. B and D have νίκᾶν, and another scholium recognizes νίκαν (τὴν νίκην ἐνεχείρισεν), which reading implies punctuation after ὤπασεν. The consideration that Phama does not give the victory is decisive against νίκαν. **ἅρμα καρύξαισα νικᾶν** is equivalent to κηρύξασα ὅτι ἅρμα νικᾷ, the present suggesting the word νικᾷ used in the herald's actual proclamation.

26. **ἀέθλοις**] games in honour of Apollo, supposed to have been founded by Adrastus. See *Nem.* IX. 9.—The recipients implied by ὤπασεν are the race of the Cleonymidae, understood from γενεᾷ in l. 21.

27. **τοιάδε**] 'such as the present', just as in *Isth.* IV. 54 καὶ τοιαίδε τιμαί, 'such victories as that which I celebrate'. We may render, *leaves of song by men of those days, like this of mine*. This, as Mr Fennell thinks, is an allusion to the shower of leaves flung over victors, a practice known as φυλλοβολία and referred to by Pindar in *Pyth.* IX. 124, πολλὰ μὲν κείνῳ δίκον φύλλ' ἔπι καὶ στεφάνους. This custom naturally suggested the figure of a flinging of verses like leaves, just as epinician poems are sometimes compared to 'crowns'; cp. *Pyth.* VIII. 57 στεφάνοισι βάλλω, and *Nem.* VII. 77.—**ἀοιδᾶν** was read by Triclinius, and was adopted by Boeckh and Dissen. B has ἀοιδῶν and D ἀοιδάν, a pair of variants which seem to point with almost mathematical certainty to ἀοιδᾶν. Many editors however (e.g. Hartung, Bergk, Fennell) accept ἀοιδῶν *poets*, from B. τῶν τότ' ἐόντων does not require a substantive, whereas φύλλα seems to demand an explanatory qualification. The scholiast appears to have read ἀοιδῶν.

28. **οὐδὲ** κ.τ.λ.] *Nor did they refrain the curved car from the universal festivals.* The subject of ἀπεῖχον is the Cleonymidae, understood from the foregoing context, though not expressly mentioned since l. 21 (γενεᾷ).—**πανάγυρις**, also in *Ol.* IX. 96. **ξυνᾶν** is added to shew that only the four great παναγύριες are meant. The house of Cleonymus competed at the Olympia, Pythia, Nemea and Isthmia, as well as at smaller παναγύριες like the Sicyonian and Athenian.—**καμπύλον** (not found elsewhere in Pindar) is an echo of the Homeric καμπύλον ἅρμα.

29. **Πανελλάνεσσι**] See *Isth.* II. 38. —**ἐρίζω** and **ἐρίζομαι** are used by Pindar indifferently.—**δαπάνᾳ ἵππων**, cp. δαπάνᾳ τε χαρεὶς *Isth.* V. 10. See above l. 14.

30. **τῶν ἀπειράτων**] *Those who make no trial inherit silences which know them not.* The Cleonymidae, though they

ἔστιν δ' ἀφάνεια τύχας καὶ μαρναμένων, ἐπ. β'.
πρὶν τέλος ἄκρον ἱκέσθαι·
τῶν τε γὰρ καὶ τῶν διδοῖ·
καὶ κρέσσον' ἀνδρῶν χειρόνων
ἔσφαλε τέχνα καταμάρψαισ'. ἴστε μὰν Αἴαντος ἀλκὰν φοίνιον,
τὰν ὀψίᾳ 35

won no chariot victories at the great games (had such been won, Pindar would have mentioned them), still have the merit of having taken part in the competition; they are not ἀπείρατοι. For ἀπείρᾱτος see note on *Nem.* I. 24.—**ἄγνωστοι** (al. ἄγνωτοι; so Cobet), best taken active, as in *Ol.* VI. 67.

31. **ἔστιν δ'** κ.τ.λ.] *But obscurity is Fortune's portion to men even when they contend, until they reach the high end* (that is, win the prize of victory).—**ἀφάνεια τύχας,** *obscuritas quam* τύχα *affert* (Dissen); cp. τύχα πότμου, *Pyth.* II. 56. ἀφάνεια is not found elsewhere in Pindar. —**μαρναμένων** (strictly genitive absolute, as Mr Fennell says) is equivalent to πειρώντων, opposed to τῶν ἀπειράτων.—**ἄκρον**, cp. *Nem.* VI. 24 πρὸς ἄκρον ἀρετᾶς ἦλθον.

33. **τῶν τε καὶ τῶν**] *For she* (Fortune) *giveth of this and that,* that is, of good and bad luck. For **τὰ καὶ τά** see note on *Nem.* I. 30.—**διδοῖ**, cp. imperative δίδοι. Pindar has also δίδωσι.—The MSS. (B and D) have τέλος after διδοῖ contrary to the metre; hence the reading of the editio Romana τῶν τε γὰρ διδοῖ τέλος. Hartung conjectured τῶν τε γὰρ καὶ τῶν δόσις. In the scholia there is no trace pointing to τέλος, which was clearly brought in from the preceding line with the idea of supplying a construction to the partitive genitive τῶν καὶ τῶν.

35. **τέχνᾳ**] So B and scholiast (ἐποίησε καταγωνισθῆναι τέχνῃ), but D τέχνα. (1) It seems rather more likely that τέχνα should have come from τέχνᾳ than that the dative should have been substituted for the nominative. We can readily understand that a scribe might have failed to see that τύχα is the subject of ἔσφαλε. (2) The passage gains by the carrying on of the same subject throughout. τέχνα is the instrument of τύχα, and we may render:

*And she useth the art of worse men to clutch back and trip up a better man than they.*

The scholia point to a reading καταμάρψαι, approved of by Mommsen. For this verb see *Nem.* III. 35, *Ol.* VI. 14.—**ἀνδρῶν** responds to **ἀνήρ** l. 70.

**ἴστε μὰν** κ.τ.λ.] 'Ye know, assuredly, of the blood-dyed valorous body of Aias, which at the late time of night he pierced with his own sword, and how the flesh encompassed the blade, and the blood he shed was drops of blame for all the Hellênes who went to Troy'.—The difficulties in this carefully elaborated sentence are: (1) Ajax is said 'to cut his valour', ἀλκάν being equivalent to 'strong body'. A little reflection will shew that this curious usage was an artifice designed to suit the special circumstances of the case. If Ajax had been slain by another, the poet could have written quite simply ἴστε μὰν Αἴαντος ἀλκὰν φοίνιον (or Αἴαντα ἄλκιμον φοίνιον), τὸν ταμὼν ὁ δεῖνα κ.τ.λ. But it is a case of suicide, and Pindar dexterously took advantage of the idiom ἀλκὰν Αἴαντος to evade an awkward identity of the subject and object of **ταμών**, where the object is a relative pronoun (there being no reflexive relative). The addition of **φοίνιον** helps to make ἀλκάν more concrete. (2) The graphic **περὶ ᾧ φασγάνῳ**, *round his own sword* (ᾧ emphasizing the suicide), has no exact parallel; but the same figure is applied to the same event in *Nem.* VIII.

*ἐν νυκτὶ ταμὼν περὶ ᾧ φασγάνῳ μομφὰν ἔχει παίδεσσιν Ἑλλά-*
*νων, ὅσοι Τρῴανδ' ἔβαν.*

*ἀλλ' Ὅμηρός τοι τετίμακεν δι' ἀνθρώπων, ὃς αὐτοῦ* *στρ. γ'.*

23, *φασγάνῳ ἀμφικυλίσαις.* The sword piercing the body, and the body enveloping the sword, are two ways of expressing the same fact; the second is the less usual, and by choosing it Pindar heightens the effect. (3) **μομφὰν ἔχει**, a strong Pindaric expression, as though every drop of blood were a drop of blame against those who preferred Odysseus. ἔχεε and ἔχει are alternative forms; Homer has both χέε and -χει as imperatives.—Commentators have found difficulties in these words because they all assumed that ἔχει was the present of ἔχω. There are three main views. (*a*) *μομφὰν ἔχει* is active, 'lays blame on', *invidiam facit*, as in Aeschylus, *Prometheus* 444 *μέμψιν οὔτιν' ἀνθρώποις ἔχων* (so Chrysippus, Dissen, Mr Fennell, &c.). (*b*) The phrase is passive and means that the suicide was condemned by the Greeks. Schol. *οὐκ ὀλίγην μέμψιν ἔχει ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλήνων παισί.* Cp. Euripides, *Heraclidae* 974 *πολλήν ἄρ' ἕξεις μέμψιν.* To both these interpretations there is the same serious objection that a past tense is imperatively required. Christ's ἔχεν was an attempt to meet this. To (*b*) there is the special objection, urged by Mr Fennell, that the parallels produced do not warrant the construction of *μομφὰν ἔχειν* in a passive sense with the dative case. (*c*) Bergk avoids both objections by reading ἔχ' ἐν, which is accepted by Mezger. The emendation is not convincing as there is no cause for the corruption; and it may be observed in regard to (*b*) and (*c*), that there is no purpose in stating here that the Greeks blamed the act of Ajax. The point is that they were to blame for being imposed on by his rival's *τέχνα* (l. 35).

**φοίνιον** is generally taken as nothing more than the epithet of a warrior, who sheds blood in battle; compare *φοίνιος Ἄρης.* But it may well be predicate here (explained by the following relative clause) and refer to the blood of the hero's death-wound, thus suiting the phrase *ἔχει μομφάν.*—**ὀψίᾳ ἐν νυκτί.** Schol. *τοῖς δὲ τὸν ὄρθρον ἀκούουσι καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἱστορίας συνᾴδει· ὁ γὰρ τὴν Αἰθιοπίδα γράφων περὶ τὸν ὄρθρον φησὶ τὸν Αἴαντα ἑαυτὸν ἀνελεῖν.* —For **ταμὼν** Mr Tyrrell has proposed *δικὼν* (or *βαλών*), comparing Aesch. *Choeph.* 576 *ποδώκει περιβαλὼν χαλκεύματι*, and *Nem.* VIII. 23. Herwerden has suggested *πετών.*

37. **Ὅμηρος**] It is probable, as Bergk thinks, that Arctinus the author of the Aethiopis, in which the story of the *ὅπλων κρίσις* and death of Ajax was told, is meant, and not the Iliad or Odyssey. Pindar agrees with Arctinus in knowing nothing of the madness, which was ascribed to Ajax in the Little Iliad. Aeschylus, in his lost trilogy on the subject, also followed Arctinus, whereas Sophocles adopted (with modifications) the story of Lesches.—**τοι**, as usual, introducing a well-known fact.—**δι' ἀνθρώπων**, *to the ends of the earth*, lit. 'through (the borders of) men'; *ἄνθρωποι* being conceived locally as extending over the earth. Cp. *Nem.* VI. 48 *διὰ θαλάσσας πέτεται κλέος αὐτῶν.* It should be carefully observed that **δι' ἀνθρώπων** is really the predicate of the sentence, which means: 'the honour, which Homer has shed on Ajax, extends over the wide earth'. The point is not that Homer honoured him, but that his fame became world-wide through Homer's song.

**τετίμακεν** responds to **τιμάεντες**, l. 7, and *δι' ἀνθρώπων* echoes *ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους*, l. 9.

πᾶσαν ὀρθώσαις ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασεν
θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν.
τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἕρπει, 40
εἴ τις εὖ Ϝείπῃ τι, καὶ πάγκαρπον ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ διὰ πόντον βέβακεν
ἐργμάτων ἀκτὶς καλῶν ἄσβεστος αἰεί.

προφρόνων Μοισᾶν τύχοιμεν, κεῖνον ἅψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνων ἀντ. γ'.
καὶ Μελίσσῳ, παγκρατίου στεφάνωμ' ἐπάξιον,

38. **ὀρθώσαις**] *having built up;* cp. *Isth.* v. 65.—**κατὰ ῥάβδον** κ.τ.λ. *Set it forth, by the wand of divine verses, for after poets to sing at their pleasure.* Professor Jebb seized the true force of κατὰ ῥάβδον when he translated 'by the wand of his lays divine' (*Journal Hell. Studies*, III. p. 158); the ῥάβδος being the symbol, primarily of Homerid, and then of poetic, tradition. Hesiod tells how the Muses gave him as a 'sceptre' δάφνης ἐριθηλέος ὄζον (*Theogony*, 30). The scholiast interprets κατὰ στίχον, and Mezger adopts this error, due to the inveterate association of ῥάβδος and ῥάπτω, through their common association with rhapsodists. κατὰ στίχον should be kept ('nach der Reihe seiner Lieder') for the ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων of *Nem.* II. 2.—**θεσπεσίων**, compare *Nem.* IX. 7 θεσπεσία δ' ἐπέων καύχαις ἀοιδὰ πρόσφορος.—**ἀθύρειν**, song being a sport. Compare Homeric Hymn XVIII. 15 μοῦσαν ἀθύρων, *Pyth.* V. 23 κῶμον—'Απολλώνιον ἄθυρμα.

40. **τοῦτο** κ.τ.λ.] *For whatever a man speak well, this advanceth, an immortal vocal thing; and over the fruitful earth and across ocean hath it gone, a beam of fair deeds, inextinguishable for ever.*—φωνᾶεν, also in *Ol.* II. 85 βέλη φωνάεντα, and possibly in *Ol.* IX. 2.—ἕρπει (D ἕρποι) *incedit.* Cp. ὑφέρπω of the spreading of bad rumour, Sophocles *Oed. Rex* 786 and Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 450; and ἐπέρχεται φάτις, *Antigone* 700.

41, 42. **ἐπὶ χθόνα** κ.τ.λ.] For the same idea expressed in nearly the same words compare *Nem.* VI. 48; but here the word of fame is not conceived as winged.—**πάγκαρπος** also occurs in *Pyth.* IX. 58.—**ἄσβεστος** only here in Pindar; an echo of Homer's κλέος ἄσβεστον.

43. **πρόφρονων** κ.τ.λ.] The brightness of song (ἀκτίς, πυρσὸς ὕμνων) is the only antidote to the ἀφάνεια τύχας; as the word **τύχοιμεν** reminds us. *May we find Muses with fain souls to light that beacon-fire of songs for Melissus also, as a crown worthy of his victory in the pancration,—even for the branch of Telesiades.* As the beacon-fire was a means of sending news, πυρσεύειν meaning to announce by such signals, πυρσὸς ὕμνων is a felicitous expression, suggesting the noising abroad of the victory. Dissen thinks that there may also be an allusion to a torch celebration in honour of Melissus.

44. **Μελίσσῳ** responds to **Μέλισσ'** in l. 2 (Mezger).—**παγκρατίου** depends on ἐπάξιον. For **ἔρνεϊ** (like ὄζος used of offspring) cp. *Nem.* VI. 37 ἔρνεσι Λατοῦς.

45. **τόλμᾳ γὰρ** κ.τ.λ.] The MSS. have τόλμᾳ γὰρ εἰκὼς θυμὸν ἐριβρεμετᾶν θηρᾶν λεόντων ἐν πόνῳ. Numerous emendations have been proposed, but it will be enough to state those views which might be seriously entertained. (1) Boeckh, Dissen and others accepted θηρᾷ (first proposed by Thiersch, but perhaps read by a scholiast). Dissen, who deprecates any further change, explains: *audacia enim similis animum frementium consequitur leonum in certamine.* Cp. schol.:

ἔρνεϊ Τελεσιάδα. τόλμᾳ γὰρ εἰκὼς 45

τὸν τῶν λεόντων θυμὸν ἐν τοῖς πόνοις θηρᾷ. θηρᾶν θυμόν is a more than doubtful expression and would be a singularly infelicitous commendation. Boeckh made the further correction εἴκων for εἰκώς, quoting the Homeric βίῃ καὶ κάρτεϊ εἴκων. (2) A scholium seems to indicate a variant θηρῶν, which is adopted by Mommsen, Bergk, Christ, Mezger and others and explained in two ways. (*a*) Bergk takes θηρῶν and λεόντων as joined in apposition, quoting Epimenides (ap. Aelian, *H. A.* XII. 7) θῆρα λέοντα, and Euripides, *H. F.* 463 στολήν τε θηρὸς—λέοντος. (*b*) Mezger adopts the view of the scholiast who explained οἷοι οἱ λέοντες ἐν θηρσίν, thus making θηρῶν a partitive genitive dependent on λεόντων. It is to be observed that both (*a*) and (*b*) imply that ἐστι can be understood with the participle εἰκώς, a doctrine which I should find it hard to accept. Nor have these explanations the advantage of preserving the reading of MSS.; θηρῶν has only the doubtful support of a scholium. (3) Mr Fennell, who inadvertently gives θηρῶν as the reading of the MSS., thinks that λεόντων may have been a gloss on θηρῶν and have usurped the place of a verb, 'which may have been πέφανται' (thrown out by Kayser with several other rather wild proposals).

In forming a judgment on this difficult passage, it may be well to observe the following points. (1) **ἐν πόνῳ** means *in the pancration contest*, just mentioned. (2) Melissus is said to be at once a lion and a fox in the pancration. Now the defensive tactics which justify the comparison to a fox are described in the second clause (αἰετοῦ ἅτ' ἀναπιτναμένα ῥόμβον ἴσχει); and it is therefore clearly demanded by both sense and art that the offensive tactics, characteristic of the bolder lion, should be indicated in the first clause. The general contrast is marked by τόλμᾳ and μῆτιν; but the particular difference in the manner of warfare must have been mentioned in the case of the lion as well as in the case of the fox. Now a fitting word to describe a lion following prey (and not waiting to be attacked) was θηρᾶν, *to chase*, which, in the context of this metaphor, might be appropriately applied to the offensive tactics of Melissus in boxing and wrestling. I have therefore printed **θηρᾷ** in the text, and thus my reading coincides with that of Dissen, though in quite a different sense. I would render: *In strife his spirit is bold as loud-roaring lions on the track of prey*, literally 'For like in spirit to the boldness of loud-roaring lions, he chaseth (does not wait to be attacked) in the labour (of contest)'. **τόλμᾳ λεόντων εἰκώς**=λέουσιν εὐτόλμοις ἐοικώς. **θυμόν** defines εἰκώς closely, so as to suggest the psychical contrast of *spirit* and *intellect* (μῆτις). In the passage in the Eleventh Olympian, where the fox and lion also appear, there is the same suggestion (l. 19 sqq.):

ἀκρόσοφον δὲ καὶ αἰχματὰν ἀφίξεσ-
θαι. τὸ γὰρ
ἐμφυὲς οὔτ' αἴθων ἀλώπηξ
οὔτ' ἐρίβρομοι λέοντες διαλλάξαιντο ἦθος.

Here is expressed the distinction of σοφία and ἀνδρεία, the virtues of μῆτις and θυμός. **θηρᾷ** is used (like θηρεύω) with a general (cognate) object understood. Cp. οἱ θηρώμενοι 'hunters'.—I may observe that this interpretation finds support in the scholia: § καὶ τῇ μὲν τόλμῃ φησὶν αὐτὸν λέοντι θηρεύοντι ἐοικέναι, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μῆτιν ἀλώπεκι κ.τ.λ.

As for the restoration of θηρᾷ (which has perhaps support in the scholia) for θηρᾶν, Bergk has shewn that θηρᾶν arose in consequence of a variant τολμᾷ. Thus our MSS. exhibit here a composition of two sets of readings (*a*) τόλμᾳ—θηρᾷ and (*b*) τολμᾷ—θηρᾶν.

**εἰκώς**] Except here and *frag.* 81, 3 (where Boeckh unnecessarily read ἐοικός)

*θυμὸν ἐριβρεμετᾶν θηρᾷ λεόντων*
*ἐν πόνῳ, μῆτιν δ' ἀλώπηξ, αἰετοῦ ἅτ' ἀναπιτναμένα ῥόμβον ἴσχει.*
*χρὴ δὲ πᾶν ἔρδοντ' ἀμαυρῶσαι τὸν ἐχθρόν.*

*οὐ γὰρ φύσιν Ὠαριωνείαν ἔλαχεν·* ἐπ. γ'.

Pindar uses the forms *ἐοικώς, ἐοικός. εἰκώς* is found in Homer.—**ἐριβρεμετᾶν**, an Homeric epithet of Zeus. Cp. *ἐρίβρομοι λέοντες, Ol.* XI. 21.

47. **ἀλώπηξ**] For the contrast of lion and fox compare (besides *Ol.* XI. 19—21, quoted in the foregoing note) *frag.* 237 *ὄπισθε δὲ κεῖμαι ἀλωπέκων ξανθὸς λέων.* For the temper of foxes compare *Pyth.* II. 77 *ὀργαῖς ἀτενὲς ἀλωπέκων ἴκελοι.* The caution of the fox might be interpreted as cowardice: cp. Aristophanes, *Peace* 1189,

*οἴκοι λέοντες ἐν μάχῃ δ' ἀλώπεκες.*

Here the fox lies on her back and resists the eagle: schol. *ἥτις ἀνακλινομένη ὑπτία πρὸς τὸ ἑτοίμως ἀμύνεσθαι, ἐπέχει τὴν τοῦ ἀετοῦ ὁρμήν, ὅταν ἐπιρρομβῇ αὐτὴν βουλόμενος ἁρπάσαι. ἔοικε δὲ διδάσκειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πάλαισμα, ὡς χαμαὶ κειμένου καὶ τὸν μείζονα τέχνῃ νενικηκότος. καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἀλώπηξ ὑπτία τοῖς ποσὶν ἀμύνεται, τὰ μὲν συλλαμβανομένη* [*εὐλαβουμένη*, Herwerden] *τὰ δὲ ἀμύσσουσα.* There is doubtless a reference to some special wrestling trick.—**ἀναπιτναμένα**, *spreading herself on her back.* We find this verb in two other passages of Pindar in the sense of throwing open doors; active in *Ol.* VI. 27 *πύλας ὕμνων ἀναπιτνάμεν*, and passive in *Nem.* IX. 2 *ἀναπεπταμέναι θύραι.* In both these cases there is the notion of throwing *back.*—**ῥόμβον**, *whirling* or *circling swoop.* Compare *Ol.* XIII. 94 *ἀκόντων ἱέντα ῥόμβον, shooting whirling javelins.* In *frag.* 79, 4, the word is used of the giddy motion of cymbals, *ῥόμβον κυμβάλων.*—**ἴσχει** (in Pindar only here and *Pyth.* II. 29) *checks* (Lat. *cohibere*).

48. **χρὴ δὲ** κ.τ.λ.] 'It is right to use any and every means to bring one's enemy to nought'. **πᾶν ἔρδοντ'**, compare *πανοῦργος*, unscrupulous. We have the same ethical view, expressed even more clearly, in *Pyth.* II. 84:

*ποτὶ δ' ἐχθρὸν ἅτ' ἐχθρὸς ἐὼν λύκοιο δίκαν ὑποθεύσομαι,*
*ἄλλ' ἄλλοτε πατέων ὁδοῖς σκολιαῖς.*

Cp. also Euripides *Ion*, 1046:

*ὅταν δὲ πολεμίους δρᾶσαι κακῶς*
*θέλῃ τις, οὐδεὶς ἐμποδὼν κεῖται νόμος,*

where the sentiment is of course in character (the *παιδαγωγός* is the speaker).—This verse has little point in the context, unless we suppose that Melissus had employed in the contest some artifice, which aroused adverse comment. Cp. schol.: *διὰ δὲ τούτων παρίστησιν ὅτι κυλιστικὸς ἦν ὁ Μέλισσος καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἐξυπτιάσας περιεγένετο.*

**ἀμαυρῶσαι**, *to dim, put out the light of.* In *Pyth.* XII. 13, *blinded.* Cp. *frag.* 126 *μηδ' ἀμαύρου τέρψιν ἐν βίῳ, and darken not pleasure.* Simonides, *frag.* 4, *οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος.* Aesch. *Ag.* 465 *τιθεῖσ' ἀμαυρόν.* Hesiod used the form *μαυρόω* (*Works and Days*, 327 *ῥεῖα δέ μιν μαυροῦσι θεοί*). It does not follow that Pindar also used it, yet Boeckh was perhaps right in introducing it, for though there is no direct MSS. authority in this passage, ΕΡΔΟΝΤΑΜΑΥΡΩCΑΙ was ambiguous.

49. **οὐ γὰρ** κ.τ.λ.] *No, fate did not deal him the stature of an Orion; he is ill-favoured to outward view, but in battle grievous to encounter.*—**ἔλαχεν** suggests the lottery of Fate (*Lachesis*).—**φύσιν**, *growth, stature* (cp. *Nem.* VI. 6).—**Ὠαριωνείαν.** The scholiast quotes λ 309, 310,

ἀλλ' ὀνοτὸς μὲν ἰδέσθαι, 50
συμπεσεῖν δ' αἰχμᾷ βαρύς.
καίτοι ποτ' Ἀνταίου δόμους
Θηβᾶν ἀπὸ Καδμεῖᾶν μορφὰν βραχύς, ψυχὰν δ' ἄκαμπτος
προσπαλαίσων ἦλθ' ἀνὴρ
τὰν πυροφόρον Λιβύαν, κρανίοις ὄφρα ξένων ναὸν Ποσειδάωνος
ἐρέφοντα σχέθοι,

τοὺς δὴ μηκίστους θρέψε ζείδωρος ἄρουρα καὶ πολὺ καλλίους μετά γε κλυτὸν Ὠρίωνα.

Melissus was a short man.

50. **ὀνοτός**] *contemptible.* The usual form is ὀνοστός (ὄνομαι). Compare the double forms θαυματός and θαυμαστός.

51. **αἰχμᾷ**] Pauw read ἀκμᾷ and almost all editors have followed him. Dissen translates *gravis robore*, whereas Mr Fennell thinks it means 'at the crisis of the struggle', and refers to a scholiast's κατὰ τοὺς ἀγῶνας. But there is no reason to suppose that the scholiast had any other reading before him than that which the MSS. have preserved. κατὰ τοὺς ἀγῶνας is an interpretation of αἰχμᾷ, *in battle.* Compare the use of μάχα in *Ol.* VIII. 58 in reference to the pancration contest, τὰν δ' ἔπειτ' ἀνδρῶν μάχαν ἐκ παγκρατίου. The pancration resembled real war more than other contests. Christ's view that αἰχμᾷ means *temper* here is untenable, and gives a hardly appropriate sense. For αἰχμή = *battle*, see Liddell and Scott.

52. **καίτοι** κ.τ.λ.] *And yet once on a time from Cadmean Thebes unto the house of Antaeus there came, with intent to wrestle, a man in stature short, in soul inflexible, even to wheat-rich Libya, in order to check him who roofed Poseidon's temple with skulls of strangers,—the son of Alcmena, he.*—The MSS. have **ποτ'**, but editors have unanimously adopted **πότ'** (for ποτί) from Triclinius. ποτ' seems to me emphatically right. The sudden transition from the present to the remote past requires a mark of time. And a preposition is not wanted. Compare *Ol.* XIV. 21 δόμον Φερσεφόνας ἔλθ' Ἀχοῖ, *Pyth.* IV. 52 τάνδε νᾶσον ἐλθόντες. The fact that another accusative of place **τὰν πυροφόρον Λιβύαν** follows ἦλθε makes no difference.—For Antaeus, son of Poseidon and Gê, see Plato *Theaet.*, 169 B, Diodorus, IV. 17. This adventure of Heracles was represented on a metope by Praxiteles in the Heracleion at Thebes; Pausanias, IX. 11. 6. It was the subject of a picture by the vase-painter Euphemius at the end of the 6th cent. (see Roscher, *Lex. d. Myth.* p. 2207). The Antaeus who lived in Irasa was a different person; see *Pyth.* IX. 106 Ἴρασα, πρὸς πόλιν Ἀνταίου.

53. **ἄκαμπτος**] Compare *Pyth.* IV. 72 βουλαῖς ἀκάμπτοις (MSS. ἀκνάμπτοις). B gives ἄκομπος. One might guess that these variants, ἄκομπος and ἄκαμπτος, point to ἀκαμπής as a common origin.—The words are chosen so as to make it plain that Melissus is compared to Heracles. μορφὰν βραχύς (Apollodorus says that Heracles was τετραπηχυαῖος) corresponds to ὀνοτὸς ἰδέσθαι, ψυχὰν ἄκαμπτος to αἰχμᾷ βαρύς, while προσπαλαίσων suggests the wrestling contest in which Melissus had been victorious [and **σχέθοι** echoes ἴσχει in l. 47].—προσπαλαίω is also found in *Pyth.* IV. 290. The object is Ἀνταίῳ understood from Ἀνταίου.

54. **πυροφόρον**] an Homeric word, only here in Pindar. The ancients disputed the justice of the application of this epithet to Libya.—**ἐρέφοντα**, *garnishing the roof of.* Antaeus used to ornament the frieze of the temple with the skulls of strangers whom he had slain.

*υἱὸς Ἀλκμήνας· ὃς Οὔλυμπόνδ' ἔβα, γαίας τε πάσας* στρ. δ'. 55
*καὶ βαθυκρήμνου πολιᾶς ἁλὸς ἐξευρὼν θέναρ,*
*ναυτιλίαισί τε πορθμὸν ἁμερώσαις.*
*νῦν δὲ παρ' Αἰγιόχῳ κάλλιστον ὄλβον*
*ἀμφέπων ναίει, τετίματαί τε πρὸς ἀθανάτων φίλος, Ἥβαν τ' ὀπυίει,*
*χρυσέων οἴκων ἄναξ καὶ γαμβρὸς Ἥρας.* 60

Like stories were told of the Thracian Diomede, of Oenomaus and others. E. Boehmer, objecting to the substitution of ⏑⏑ in the thesis of a spondee, proposes *εἴργοντα*, and supports it by *ἐμφράττοντα* in one of the scholia. It is a clever suggestion (cp. Homeric *γέφυραι ἐεργμέναι*), but (cp. *Nem.* III. 14) the metrical canon seems doubtful.

55, 56. **γαίας** κ.τ.λ.] Heracles went to the extreme ledge of the earth where it descends steeply into the grey sea. He thus 'discovered the palm-like hollow formed by earth and ocean'.—**θέναρ** is the hollow of the hand or sole of the foot. It is found in Homer E 339 *πρυμνὸν ὕπερ θέναρος*, which means the part where the hollow of the hand slopes up to the wrist, just as *πρυμνὸς βραχίων* means the extremity of the arm where it joins the shoulder. In Aratus 718 we have *λαιοῦ δὲ θέναρ ποδός*. Pindar has *θέναρ* twice, in both cases metaphorically. In *Pyth.* IV. 206 *καὶ νεόκτιστον λίθων βωμοῖο θέναρ* it means the hollow which received the sacrifices; schol. *τὸ τοῦ βωμοῦ κοίλωμα τὸ ὑποδεχόμενον τὰ θύματα*. In the passage before us it means the basin of the sea (the Mediterranean) formed by the earth. Heracles first reached the extreme western limit and so discovered that it was really like a *θέναρ* or hollow, in the earth. The full bearings of Pindar's language have hardly been appreciated. Moreover **γαίας πάσας** has been misunderstood, being taken as plural, governed by *ἐξευρών*. But in classical Greek *γαῖα* is never found in the plural (*γῆ* hardly ever), and there is no necessity to presume it here. The scholiast knew that *γαίας* was genitive: *πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ τῆς πολυβαθοῦς θαλάσσης ἀνερευνήσας καὶ κατειληφὼς τὸ τέλος*. (Compare *πᾶσα πόλις*, *the whole city*, *Nem.* V. 47, *παντὶ στρατῷ* *Nem.* I. 61, &c.) The *θέναρ* is formed by earth and sea conjointly.—For *βαθύκρημνος*, *with high hanging cliffs*, cp. *Nem.* IX. 40.—**πολιᾶς ἁλός**, so *Ol.* I. 71, *πολιᾶς θαλάσσας* *Ol.* VII. 61. For Heracles' voyage of discovery, compare *Nem.* III. 22 sq.

57. **ναυτιλίαισι**] *and having reclaimed for navigation the passage of the sea.* **πορθμός** is the sea from a sailor's point of view, *water to be crossed.*—*ἁμερόω* and compounds were the regular words for expressing the work of Heracles and Theseus in clearing land and sea of robbers and pirates. Cp. Sophocles (*frag.* 819 Nauck, cited in the Ὑπόθεσις Ἰσθμίων ed. Abel p. 350) on Theseus:

> ὃς παρακτίαν
> στείχων ἀνημέρωσα κνωδάλων ὁδόν,

and Euripides, *Heracles* 20 *ἐξημερῶσαι γαῖαν* (cp. l. 847), quoted by Dissen.

58. **παρ' Αἰγιόχῳ**] *in the halls of the Aegis-bearer*, that is, Zeus. Compare *Nem.* I. 71, 72 *ὀλβίοις ἐν δώμασι*—*πὰρ Διὶ Κρονίδᾳ*.—**ἀμφέπων**, *experiencing, enjoying*, properly *handling*; a favourite word of Pindar. See *Nem.* VII. 10, 91 and compare *Pyth.* IV. 268 *μόχθον ἀμφέπῃ δύστανον.*

After *Αἰγιόχῳ* the MSS. insert the gloss *διί.*

59. **φίλος**] *as their friend.*—**ὀπυίει** (MSS. *ὀπύει, ὀπήει*) *has to wife.*—**τετίμαται** echoes *τετίμακεν* l. 37 (Mezger).

τῷ μὲν Ἀλεκτρᾶν ὕπερθεν δαῖτα πορσύνοντες ἀστοὶ ἀντ. δ'.
καὶ νεόδματα στεφανώματα βωμῶν αὔξομεν
ἔμπυρα χαλκοαρᾶν ὀκτὼ θανόντων,
τοὺς Μεγάρα τέκε Ϝοι Κρειοντὶς υἱούς·
τοῖσιν ἐν δυθμαῖσιν αὐγᾶν φλὸξ ἀνατελλομένα συνεχὲς παννυχίζει
αἰθέρα κνισάεντι λακτίζοισα καπνῷ, 66

61. **τῷ μὲν** κ.τ.λ.] *To him*, that is Heracles, opposed to Melissus, who appears in l. 70 as **ὅδε** ἀνήρ—δέ corresponding to μέν.—The altars were stationed and the sacrifice was celebrated outside the Electra gates, on rising ground (ὕπερθεν). From these gates led the road to Plataea.—**πορσύνοντες**, *apparantes*.—**ἀστοί**, *we citizens of Thebes*.

62. **καὶ νεόδματα** κ.τ.λ.] **καὶ** connects δαῖτα with στεφανώματα. **νεόδματα στεφανώματα βωμῶν** are generally explained as fresh *wreaths to crown the altars*. But Mezger (after Friederichs) takes it of newly built altars, 'neugebaute Altarzierden d.h. die Zierde neugebauter Altäre'. νεόδματα seems decisive in favour of this interpretation. It is true that in such compounds the second part sometimes becomes deadened by use; but if we reflect that νεόδματος is found nowhere else in Greek literature and was probably invented by Pindar for the present passage, we cannot admit that -δματος had no significance or that νεόδματα is a mere synonym of νέα. It would be an infelicitous coinage to apply to garlands; whereas it would be highly appropriate to emphasize the unusual practice of using temporary altars at this yearly feast in celebration of the children of Heracles. There were clearly eight altars, and they were doubtless arranged in a *circle*: this is the force of **στεφανώματα**, which Pindar has chosen in order to signal to **στεφάνωμ'** in l. 44.

**αὔξομεν ἔμπυρα**] *we offer burnt sacrifice*. The only parallel quoted is Euripides, *Hippolytus* 537 βούταν φόνον 'Ελλὰς αἴ' ἀέξει *Greece offereth the blood of oxen*. Dissen also refers to *augere aram* in Plautus, *Mercator* IV. I. II. αὔξειν seems to have been a solemn euphemism for the slaying of victims.

63. **χαλκοαρᾶν** κ.τ.λ.] *In memory of the death of eight bronze-mailed sons, born to him by Megara daughter of Creon*. **χαλκοάρας** (also in *Isth.* IV. 41) = χαλκήρης. It signals to l. 15. The neutral θανόντων does not prove that Pindar was ignorant of the legend that the children of Heracles were slain by his own hand. He may have known it. But he did not accept it as part of the genuine Life of Heracles.

64. **τέκε Ϝοι**] τέκε οἱ Mingarelli and subsequent editors; MSS. οἱ τέκε.

65. **τοῖσιν** κ.τ.λ.] *In whose honour, what time the sunbeams sink, riseth another sunlike flame and blazeth all night long continuously, kicking the aether with savoury smoke*.—Notice the contrast of δυθμαῖσιν and ἀνατελλομένα. When the true sun sets, another light rises *to take its place*.—**συνεχές**, only here in Pindar, goes closely with παννυχίζει, rendering the παν- more emphatic. παννυχίζω is the technical word for celebrating a παννυχίς, *pervigilium*.—**αὐγαί** without definition, for *sunlight*, is often found in such phrases as αὐγὰς βλέπειν. Hippocrates uses αὐγαί in the sense of *days*.

66. **κνισάεντι**] Scan as a trisyllable: cp. φωνάεντα *Ol.* II. 93, ἀργάεντα *Ol.* XIII. 69, αἰγλάεντα *Pyth.* II. 10; Iliad, Σ 475 χρυσὸν τιμῆντα. The MSS. have κνισάντι, and Mommsen restored the right form which also occurs in *Ol.* VII. 80 μήλων τε κνισάεσσα πομπά. Here αἰθέρᾰ before κν.—A scholiast criticises **λακτίζοισα** as too harsh a metaphor (σκληροτέρᾳ δὲ κέχρηται

καὶ δεύτερον ἆμαρ ἐτείων τέρμ' ἀέθλων ἐπ. δ'.
γίνεται, ἰσχύος ἔργον.
ἔνθα λευκωθεὶς κάρα
μύρτοις ὅδ' ἀνὴρ διπλόαν 70

μεταφορᾷ· ἐχρῆν γὰρ εἰπεῖν Ψαύουσα ἢ θιγγάνουσα τοῦ αἰθέρος ἡ κνῖσα τοῦ καπνοῦ) and prefers the Homeric line, A 317

κνίση δ' οὐρανὸν ἷκεν ἑλισσομένη περὶ καπνῷ.

Hecker proposed πλακτίζοισα *lashing*.

67. **καὶ δεύτερον** κ.τ.λ.] *And during the second day taketh place the celebration of the yearly games, a feat of strength.*

The MSS. give, in defiance of the metre, ἐτείων ἀέθλων τέρμα. I have, with some hesitation, followed my predecessors, who have unanimously accepted Schmid's emendation ἐτείων τέρμ' ἀέθλων, one of those transpositions which are superficially so simple, yet often so doubtful. Besides the critical difficulty that the order of words in the MSS. is not accounted for, the phrase τέρμ' ἀέθλων is a difficult one. (*a*) Heyne explains *a definite day of games*; but, as Dissen remarks, that could not be called ἰσχύος ἔργον, and δεύτερον ἆμαρ is clearly accusative. (*b*) Granting that τέρμ' ἀέθλων might possibly bear the meaning proposed by Dissen *victoriarum reportatio* (rather 'prize of contests', cp. τέλος *Isth.* I. 27), it is inconceivable that Pindar would have written τέρμ' ἀέθλων ἐτείων γίγνεται in the sense 'victories are won every year'. But τέρμα in such a sense is doubtful; for τέλος and τέρμα are not synonymous, as is sometimes lightly assumed. (*c*) Mr Fennell explains 'the end consisting of annual games'. Thus the sentence would mean: on the second day the feast concluded with games. This is certainly possible, but it throws emphasis on an insignificant circumstance.

If τέρμ' is right (and it may well be so), the phrase is simply equivalent to ἄεθλα, τέρμ' ἔτειον, or, more simply still, ἄεθλα ἔτεια. Any event which recurs at fixed intervals is a τέρμα; it marks the completion of a περίοδος; and an annual feast is a τέρμα ἔτειον. The point to be observed is that τέρμα adds nothing to the sense; it merely emphasizes what is implied in ἐτείων, and is of subordinate importance to ἀέθλων. We may compare such phrases as βία Κάστορος, where an attribute takes grammatically the place of the subject. ἀέθλων may be regarded as genitive of material. ἰσχύος ἔργον is in apposition formally with τέρμα, really with ἄεθλα.

69. **ἔνθα** κ.τ.λ.] 'at which the head of this man was thrice made white with myrtle flowers, twice when he was declared victor as a man, the third time in the days of his boyhood'.—The wreath of victory was of myrtle because the feast was in honour of the dead. Schol. τὸ δὲ μύρτοις ὅτι μυρσίνης στεφάνοις ἐν Θήβαις στεφανοῦνται οἱ νικῶντες τὰ Ἰολάεια. μυρσίνῃ γὰρ στεφανοῦνται διὰ τὸ εἶναι τῶν νεκρῶν στέφος. The verb λευκόω is, I believe, not found elsewhere in early poetry.—**ὅδ'**, see above, note on l. 61. **ἀνὴρ** is emphatic, opposed to παίδων.—**ἀνεφάνατο**, *caused to be declared.* The genitive παίδων depends on νίκαν, *a victory over boys.*—The MSS have παίδων τρίταν without a copulative conjunction. The choice is between καὶ παίδων τρίταν (Mommsen 'de sententia Chrysippi') and παίδων τε τρίταν (Hermann, Bergk). I have adopted the first correction as it seems more likely that ΚΑΙ should have fallen out before ΠΑΙ than that ΤΕ should have disappeared before ΤΡ.

*νίκαν ἀνεφάνατο καὶ παίδων τρίταν πρόσθεν, κυβερνατῆρος οἰακοστρόφου*
*γνώμᾳ πεπιθὼν πολυβούλῳ. σὺν Ὀρσέᾳ δέ νιν κωμάξομαι, τερπνὰν ἐπιστάζων χάριν.*

71. **κυβερνατῆρος**] The trainer Orseas is compared to a helmsman. In *Nem.* VI. 66 the trainer Melesias is compared to a charioteer. Pindar has *κυβερνατήρ* also in *Pyth.* IV. 274, but *κυβερνάτας* in *Pyth.* I. 91. Both forms are Homeric.

72. **πεπιθών**] This instance of the strong aorist active of *πείθω* bearing an intransitive meaning stands alone, unless *γνώμᾳ πιθών* be right in that very uncertain passage, *Pyth.* III. 28. The verbal resemblance of these two cases is decidedly remarkable. There the MSS. vary between *γνώμᾳ πεπιθών* and *γνώμαν πεπιθών* (both readings are unmetrical, *πιθών* being required by the metre in either case). Hartung reads *πεπιθώς* here, but it would be hazardous to deny that *πεπιθών* could have been used intransitively. We may remember that while *πιθήσω* is intransitive, *πεπιθήσω* is transitive.

**κωμάξομαι**] Pindar has the form *κωμάσομαι* in *Pyth.* IX. 89. See my notes on *Nem.* II. 24, IX. 1.—B has *κωμάζομαι*, which is adopted by Donaldson.—*In company with Orseas will I celebrate him, shedding on him the delight of a gracious song of praise.* The *κῶμος* is called a *χάρις* in *Pyth.* II. 72. Cp. *Isth.* I. 6 and III. A 8.—**ἐπιστάζων** is preserved in the scholia and in the MSS. of Triclinius. B has *ἀποστάζων* and D *ἐπιστοχάζων*, and by combining these variants we might have deduced *ἐπιστάζων* without independent evidence. The scribe who wrote *ἐπιστοχάζων* (*ἅπαξ εἰρ.*) probably remembered in an unfortunate moment that Pindar sometimes speaks of shooting arrows of song and of the 'aim of the Muses'; and, with this idea in his head, foisted on Pindar a spurious derivative from *στόχος*.

# ISTHMIAN IV. AND ISTHMIAN V.

## ODES IN HONOUR OF VICTORIES IN THE PANCRATION AT ISTHMUS WON BY PHYLACIDAS OF AEGINA.

### INTRODUCTION.

In the ode[1], which Pindar composed for the Nemean victory of Pytheas, son of Lampon, a prospect was held out of a victory at Isthmus. In that hymn, perfumed with the scents of the sea, as a sort of offering to the Sea-god and the Nereids, a covert invitation to them to be gracious to the Aeginetan boy, Peleus, who became the γαμβρός of Poseidon, was the hero of the myth; and it was suggested that, as he won a bride from the sea, so Pytheas might win a wreath in the Sea-god's games.

We know not whether Pytheas ever competed for an Isthmian crown; if he did, he was not successful. But nevertheless the desired Isthmian victory came to his house; Poseidon and the 'golden Nereids' had not forgotten the persuasions of the poet. Phylacidas, the brother of Pytheas—a younger brother, we can hardly doubt—was successful in the Isthmian pancration, and Pindar was again called upon to sing the glory of Lampon's son. In this ode (*Isthmian* v.) he also looks forward to the future, and holds out the prospect of a still higher achievement, a victory at Olympia itself. He prays to Zeus that such a favour may be vouchsafed to Phylacidas, and illustrates his theme by the prayer of Heracles that *his* friend Telamon should have the son which he desired.

But Aeginetan Lampon was not as lucky as Aeginetan Telamon; nor was the prayer of Theban Pindar fulfilled like the prayer of Theban Heracles. Phylacidas did not carry off the olive wreath from Olympia; that he competed for it, we need not doubt. But other exploits, though not the crowning exploit of all, were wrought; he won a second victory at Isthmus, and also a Nemean crown to set beside his brother's. These exploits demanded a third hymn, which has also come down to us as

[1] *Nemean* v.

*Isthmian* IV., though it is meant at least as much for the Nemean as for the Isthmian victory[1].

Thus we have a triad of odes composed for the house of Lampon; the first looking forward to the second, and the second looking forward to the third. That they are interdependent he tells us himself in the opening lines of the second, where he looks backward to the former poem and forward to a later. From the circumstances of the case, the earliest of the three was composed without any thought that it was to be one of a triplet. When Pindar framed the Fifth Nemean, he hoped that an Isthmian victory would be achieved, and expected doubtless that he would be requested to honour it by a song. But there is no sign that he deliberately looked further still, and contemplated yet a third victory in the more distant future. When however the Isthmian success was actually gained, and it was known that Phylacidas intended to try his fortune on the banks of the Alpheus, the definite idea of a group of three odes celebrating Lampon's sons entered Pindar's mind. There was a certain religious sanctity about the number three; and thus it might seem appropriate to hymns dealing with religious festivals. Accordingly Pindar imagines three libations of song, poured by himself in the banquet-chamber of Lampon. It so chanced that the comparison was curiously precise in details. Of the regular three σπονδαί at a feast, the first was always to Zeus; the second might be to any lesser divinities or heroes; the third was invariably to Zeus Sôtêr. The musical libations exactly corresponded to this order. The first—the Nemean hymn—was to Zeus, in whose honour the Nemean festival was held. The second (*Isthmian* V.) is an offering to Poseidon and the Nereids. May the third be to Zeus of Olympia, proving himself a true Sôtêr!—and then the series of libations will be perfect. Zeus of Olympia was indeed to receive no drink-offering from a son of Lampon; yet the third hymn came and, as it was partly at least in honour of Zeus of Nemea, it might be regarded technically as the third libation.

As these three odes form explicitly an interdependent group, it is natural that there should be points of contact between them and cross-allusions from one to another. We should not be surprised to find references to the first in the second and third; and references in the third to the second. The connexion between *Isthmian* IV. and V. is close indeed, as will be shewn in due course by a list of echoes. The links with *Nemean* V. are fewer; but there are two striking expressions in that ode which recur in its later fellows.

The feelings of Peleus, when Hippolyte tempted him to a flagrant violation of the rights of Zeus Xenios, are thus described (*Nem.* V. 32):

τοῦ δ' ὑπ' ὀργὰν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι.

Neither ὀργά nor κνίζω is common in Pindar, but both words occur again in each of the Isthmian Odes to Phylacidas, in reference to the ambitions and

[1] Thus Mr Fennell is not far astray in regarding it as a *Nemean* ode (Preface to his *Nemean and Isthmian Odes*, p. viii.).

hospitality of Lampon or his prototypes the Aeacids. In the second 'bowl of song' we have

l. 14 τοίαισιν ὀργαῖς εὔχεται

of Lampon, and

l. 50 ἀδεῖα δ' ἔνδον νιν ἔκνιξεν χάρις

of Heracles, whose joy depends on his affection for his ξεῖνος Telamon. In the τριτόσπονδος ὕμνος, we find

l. 34 μεγαλήτορες ὀργαὶ
Αἰακοῦ παίδων τε,

and l. 57 οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι
ἐλπίδων ἔκνισ' ὄπιν

of the ambition of Lampon.

At the end of *Nemean* v. two victims of Themistius are designated by the remarkable phrase **διπλόαν ἀρετάν** (l. 62). This is applied, in *Isthmian* IV., to the two Isthmian crowns of Phylacidas: **διπλόα** θάλλοισ' **ἀρετά** (l. 17: with θάλλοισα cp. ξὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισσιν, *Nem.* v. 54)[1].

We may now proceed to consider in detail the two Isthmian odes, taking them in their chronological order.

## ISTHMIAN V.

This is distinctly a hymn which looks forward to the future rather than back to the past. The poet dwells less on the greatness of the things that have been achieved than on the prospect of achieving greater things still. The Isthmian wreath of Phylacidas, and the Nemean wreath of his brother, are regarded as the earnest of more glorious garlands. Their father Lampon, a keen enthusiast for the national *agones*, spared no expense in enabling his sons to compete; and we may suppose that few things gratified him more than their success. The one thing wanting, to crown his happiness, was a victory at the Olympian games. An Olympian wreath was the highest prize in the career of an athlete; and if either of his sons should win that glory, Lampon might feel prepared to die, having received the greatest satisfaction that life could bestow.

[1] Further; Νηρεΐδεσσι *Isth.* v. 6 was possibly suggested by the prominent part played by the Nereids in *Nem.* v.—*Isth.* v. 25 Πηλέος εὐδαίμονος γαμβροῦ θεῶν: *Nem.* v. 37 γαμβρὸν Ποσειδάωνα πείσαις.—*Isth.* v. 23 καὶ πέραν Νείλοιο παγᾶν καὶ δι' Ὑπερβορέους: *Nem.* v. 21 καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί, of the fame of the Aeacids.—Compare also the *assent* of Zeus in the case of Peleus and in the case of Telamon: *Nem.* v. 34 κατένευσέν τέ ϝοι ὀρσινεφὴς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεὺς κ.τ.λ. *Isth.* v. 49 ταῦτ' ἄρα ϝοι φαμένῳ μέμψιν θεὶς ἀρχὸν οἰωνῶν κ.τ.λ.; in both cases the divine grace is earned by respect for hospitality.—*Isth.* IV. 11 κρίνεται δ' ἀλκὰ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν, is a repetition of πότμος δὲ κρίνει συγγενὴς ἔργων περὶ πάντων.—Compare too the principle of silence in *Nem.* v. 18 and *Isth.* IV. 51.

And Phylacidas was actually making ready to contend at Olympia—perhaps in the same year that he prospered at the Isthmus, perhaps two years later[1]. Pindar's ode is a prayer that he may prosper in the greater trial, as he prospered in the lesser.

In his Aeginetan odes Pindar always introduces the Aeacids, and usually tales of their deeds. These tales are generally worked into the web of the poem by means of a comparison between the victor who is celebrated and the legendary hero whose adventures are told. In the present instance, the poet found a suitable myth, ready to his hand, in an episode related in the *Eoiai* of Hesiod. Heracles comes to the house of Telamon, to call him to sail against Troy. He finds his friend feasting, and, as he pours the usual libation with the golden phiale offered to him, prays to his father Zeus that the dearest wish of Telamon may be accomplished, even that a son of strength and spirit may be born to him. Zeus sends an eagle in token that the prayer is granted, and Heracles bids his host call the promised son Aias after the eagle (*αἰετός*).

The application is this. As Heracles prayed to Zeus for his friend Telamon, so Pindar prays to Zeus for his friend Lampon[2]. And the boon for which he supplicates is an Olympian victory. The parallel is skilfully worked out in details.

(1) *The Libation.*—The hymn opens with the prayer for an Olympian victory; and we are reminded that it is offered up at the festal board spread in honour of the Isthmian achievement of Phylacidas. Even so the prayer of Heracles was uttered at a banquet.

1 *θάλλοντος ἀνδρῶν ὡς ὅτε συμποσίου.*
36 *τετμών κύρησεν δαινύμενον.*

The custom of three libations (the third to Zeus Sôtêr) is artfully adapted to the purpose of the poet's prayer. The first was poured out[3] after the victory of Pytheas at Nemea (a libation to Zeus); the second is now being offered, after the Isthmian victory, to Poseidon and the Nereids;—may we hereafter pour the third phiale of song to Zeus the Olympian! Thus Pindar, like Heracles, prays on the occasion of a drink-offering.

9 **σπένδειν μελιφθόγγοις ἀοιδαῖς.**
37 **νεκταρέαις σπονδαῖσιν ἄρξαι.**

(2) *The Prayer.*—In the first antistrophos Pindar repeats his prayer in another form with special reference to Lampon. He beseeches Clotho and the Fates to accomplish the wishes of his friend.

16 *ἐγὼ δ' ὑψίθρονον*
**Κλωθὼ** *κασιγνήτας τε προσεννέπω ἕσπεσθαι κλυταῖς*
**ἀνδρὸς φίλου Μοίρας** *ἐφετμαῖς.*

[1] For the possible chronology see *Appendix E.*

[2] Mezger was the first to see the significance of the myth. He points out that Telamon and Heracles correspond respectively to Lampon and Pindar; and that *ἀνδρὶ τῷδε* and *μοιρίδιον* in v. 46 signal to *ἀνδρὸς φίλου* and *Μοίρας* l. 18.

[3] The libations are of course figurative,—'honeyed songs'.

So too the influence of the Fates is remembered in the prayer of Heracles[1]:

45 λίσσομαι παῖδα θρασὺν ἐξ Ἐριβοίας
ἀνδρὶ τῷδε ——— μοιρίδιον τελέσαι.

ἀνδρὸς φίλου and ἀνδρὶ τῷδε indicate that Telamon corresponds to Lampon. τελέσαι echoes the idea expressed in πορσαίνοντας l. 8[2].

(3) *Nemea.*—The *first* libation of song presented by Lampon's sons to Zeus was in consequence of the victory of Pytheas at *Nemea.* If Phylacidas win at Olympia[3], Zeus will receive another libation. This thought is curiously worked out in the mythical parallel. Heracles prayed that the body of Telamon's future son might be as strong as the lion whose skin he wore. That lion was slain at *Nemea* and was the *first* of the hero's labours. Thus in both cases a first success at Nemea is taken to shadow forth good fortune in the future. Here the signalling is emphatic:

3 κίρναμεν Λάμπωνος εὐάθλου γενεᾶς ὕπερ ἐν Νεμέᾳ μὲν πρῶτον ὦ Ζεῦ—
48 ὃν πάμπρωτον ἀέθλων κτεῖνά ποτ' ἐν Νεμέᾳ.

(4) *The Omen.*—Zeus sent the αἰετός as a sign that a son should be born to Telamon; and the ominous name Αἴας was to commemorate the incident of the libation of Heracles. Even so the crown at Nemea, granted by Zeus, is regarded as an omen that the crown at Olympia will be granted too[4].

(5) *Glory for the city.*—The wish which Heracles expressed on behalf of Telamon was one whose fulfilment not only concerned the private happiness of his friend, but also affected the city. The citizens were interested in the birth of an heir to their ruler. This bearing of the event was, if I am not mistaken, expressed by the word ξυνόδαμον (l. 46). In the same way the victories of the sons of Lampon reflected glory on Aegina, and Lampon's activity in encouraging their athletic tastes was a general benefit. An Olympian victory would be an occasion for joy in the city. This is suggested by the description of Lampon as

69 ξυνὸν ἄστει κόσμον ἑῷ προσάγων.

While the prayer is the main theme and purpose of the poem, there are other points worthy of notice in its setting. The fame won by Lampon and his sons in the sphere of athletic rivalry is compared to the fame of the Aeacid heroes,—Peleus, Ajax, and Telamon. Words are grouped in the eulogy of Lampon (at the beginning of antistr. 1) so as to signal to the expressions used in praise of the Aeacidae.

10 εἰ γάρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάνᾳ τε χαρεὶς
καὶ πόνῳ πράσσει θεοδμάτους ἀρετάς,
σύν τέ Ϝοι δαίμων φυτεύει δόξαν ἐπήρατον κ.τ.λ.

[1] These correspondences were noticed and fully appreciated by Mezger.

[2] Compare also εὐχαῖς 44 and εὔχεται 14; ἑπέσθω 49 and ἑσπέσθαι 17.

[3] That Phylacidas, not Pytheas, was the aspirant to the olive-wreath is inferred by Mezger from the metrical responsion Φυλακίδα νικῶντος l. 7, Φυλακίδᾳ γὰρ ἦλθον l. 57.

[4] For Lampon the αἰετός is the Nemean wreath.

The four ideas here emphasized—(1) *delight* in the outlay demanded by athletic competitions, (2) *labour*, (3) the prospering of *divine* prowess, (4) the prize of *glory*– are repeated in the verses which tell of Peleus and Telamon:

25 Πηλέος κλέος ἥρωος εὐδαίμονος γαμβροῦ θεῶν,

and 27 τὸν χαλκοχάρμαν ἐς πόλεμον
ἄγε......σύμμαχον ἐς Τρωΐαν, ἥρωσι μόχθον.

More than once in Pindar the quest of Troy is used as a type of athletic contests. Here it is described as 'a weary quest for heroes'; but its capture brought fame. For the hero of this ode, his plain of Troy was the Isthmus[1]. And as it is on the occasion of the adventure of Troy that Heracles prays for the birth of Ajax, so it is on the occasion of the Isthmian contest that Pindar prays for an Olympian crown. And it is perhaps hinted in his language, that both Heracles and he perform a twofold function. Heracles takes Telamon to Troy, the place where glory is won, and also prays for offspring; Pindar composes an Isthmian hymn for the glory of Lampon's house, and also prays for success at Olympia. The double part played by Heracles is suggested by the phrase χεῖρας ἀμάχους (41): reminding us that those hands slew Alcyoneus (χερσίν 34), against whom he went with Telamon; and that Telamon and he had often fought side by side (πρόφρονα σύμμαχον 28). Heracles is thus represented as having much to do with the fame of Telamon even as Pindar has had much to do, by his songs, with the fame of Lampon[2].

The tale of Heracles appearing in the house of Telamon and all that happened there is one of the most clearly drawn pictures that Pindar has left us. The war of Heracles and Telamon against Troy was the subject of the east pediment of the temple of Athene at Aegina; but the chronology hardly permits us to suppose that 'the poet's immediate theme may have occurred to his mind as he gazed on the sculptor's work in the splendid entablature of the temple[3].' Many striking thoughts and phrases have been also shed in this libation from the golden phiale. Besides the comparison of the three victories to the three solemn drink-pourings, we have the casting anchor at the shore of luck; the high road to the ends of the world; the musical dews which water Aegina and the kinsfolk of the victor; the quotation from Hesiod to the effect that 'practice makes perfect'; the whetstone of Naxos; the draught from a Dirce whose waters are spiritual.

And there is a note of gold in the ode—an omen, one is tempted to

[1] This may be suggested by the emphatic

30 ἐν ναυσίν,

responding to

5 νῦν αὖ τίν, Ἰσθμοῦ δέσποτα
Νηρεΐδεσσί τε.

[2] The name Ἡρακλέης suggests fame—the fame of heroes; and it is placed in a most prominent position at the beginning of a strophe, while its 'etymology' is introduced in l. 25 κλέος ἥρωος (rendered more emphatic by ἥρωσι coming shortly after, l. 28).

[3] Professor Jebb on *Pindar*, *Journal of Hell. Studies*, III. p. 178.

guess, of the golden olive leaves[1] which might one day, if Zeus were gracious to the poet's prayer, shine on the head of Phylacidas. In each of the three metrical systems there is gold; the golden chariots of the Aeacidae, the golden phiale with which the guest made libation, the golden robe of Mnamosyna, mother of the Muses.

## ISTHMIAN IV.

When we next hear of Phylacidas, he has won a second Isthmian victory, and has also a Nemean wreath of his own to set beside that of his elder brother. We have no means of knowing for certain how many years elapsed between the two Isthmian successes, and between the two odes in which Pindar celebrated them. We know that the Second Ode was written after—and clearly not many years after—the Battle of Salamis. This seems to imply that the second Isthmian victory was won not earlier than 480; probably not later than 478. Greater precision than this we cannot attain as to the absolute date[2]. But as to the distance of time between the two odes there is one point which may be determined with certainty. *A celebration of the Olympian games had taken place in the interval.* This we can infer without any hesitation from the ode before us. We can infer that it had not seemed good to Zeus to fulfil the prayer of Pindar; Phylacidas had not won an Olympian wreath. That he had striven for it and failed is suggested by a delicate tone of consolation, and proved by abundant allusions to the hymn in which the unratified prayer was offered. In fact the two odes must be read in close connexion in order to understand the second.

The invocation[3] tô the strange goddess Theia, 'mother of the sun', who so rarely appears in our extant Greek literature, has always been a puzzle. Her connexion with the rest of the ode has never been quite clear. But the puzzle is solved and the presence of the 'golden goddess' as she was called (*Chryse*) is adequately explained if we recognize that a disappointment at Olympia was fresh in Pindar's mind, when he composed the ode,

[1] This is the constant import of gold in Pindar. See my ed. of the *Nemean Odes*.

[2] See *Appendix E*.

[3] Mezger thinks that the chief idea of the ode is 'der hohe Werth der Kampfspiele'. He points out that games are compared with commerce in l. 7 (ἀγωνίοις ἀέθλοισι), and with war in l. 55 (ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν). They are distinguished from mercantile pursuits in that glory, not gold, is their object; they resemble war in leading both to glory and to song. Gold is chased for the sake of Theia σέο ϝέκατι l. 2; glory for the sake of Zeus, Διὸς ἕκατι, l. 29, in the same position in the same verse of the strophe. This is as much as to say that Theia is merely introduced in order to be shown her place. It seems to me that the contrast of games with trade would not justify the prominent position given to Theia; nor explain the association of other things, besides gold, with the goddess.—For the historical significance of the Ode cp. general Introduction.

and in fact that this disappointment determined the argument and character of the composition.

'It is for thy sake, O Theia, that men esteem gold preeminently'. The gold that concerned the son of Lampon was the symbolic gold, of which we so often read in the Epinician hymns,—the olive-wreath of Olympia. That was the gold which an athlete esteemed above all other things, περιώσιον ἄλλων. And that this is the significance of the lines addressed to Theia may be inferred not only from the last verse of the invocation (7 *sqq.* ἔν τ' ἀγωνίοις ἀέθλοισι κ.τ.λ.) but from a metrical responsion, which shows why the goddess is introduced:

6 διὰ τεάν, ὦ 'νασσα, τιμάν κ.τ.λ.
54 μέλιτι καὶ τοιᾷδε τιμᾷ καλλίνικον κ.τ.λ.

But there are other things too (Pindar tells Phylacidas) which may be associated with Theia; success in battle, for example, or a quantity of Epinician wreaths (ll. 4—10). And these things have been achieved by the sons of Lampon and by their country. Aegina played an illustrious part in the battle of Salamis; that was an example of 'ships striving in the sea' for the 'honour' of Theia. Phylacidas had won two Isthmian and two Nemean crowns before then; there was an example of 'a group of wreaths' (ἀθρόοι στέφανοι). The poet bids the victor be content if he has the two things that really constitute a happy life; fame and prosperity:

εἴ τις εὖ πάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούσῃ.

And when the warning is given, 'Seek not to become Zeus',—that is as much as to say, it is not given to all to ascend Olympus: you must not be disappointed that the highest victory of all was not vouchsafed to you. Mortals must make up their minds to recognize the conditions of mortal life; and one of these is that success is not always sure.

16 θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει.

Yes, the sons of Lampon are limited by mortality; but certainly their native island holds a conspicuous place in the world of mortals.

43 τοῖσιν Αἴγιναν προφέρει στόμα πάτραν
διαπρεπέα νᾶσον.

Recently Salamis can testify to her warlike prowess (48); in ancient days her heroes were sung by poets (26). Pindar places her three times in a very prominent position; at the beginning of strophe 2 τάνδ' ἐς εὔνομον πόλιν, of epode 2 ἀλλ' ἐν Οἰνώνᾳ, and of strophe 3 τοῖσιν Αἴγιναν.

The central system of the hymn is occupied with the mythical Aeacids, and chiefly with the second expedition against Troy, which is always called 'the Trojan war'. In the earlier hymn (*Isthmian* v.), on the other hand, the first expedition against Troy, that of Heracles and Telamon, was introduced; and we saw that the strife of the heroes at Troy was typical of the strife of the pancratiasts at the Isthmus. It seems possible that the second Trojan war may represent the second Isthmian victory of Phylacidas, just as the first Trojan war represented his first victory. This significance of the two

wars is perhaps indicated by a signal. In the 1st epode we find the striking expression

17 τὶν δ' ἐν Ἰσθμῷ διπλόα θάλλοισ' ἀρετά.

In the 2nd epode we read,

36 δὶς πόλιν Τρώων πράθον ἑσπόμενοι
Ἡρακλῆι πρότερον
καὶ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις.

This comparison suggests that his earlier hymn was before the mind of Pindar when he composed the later. In fact, διπλόα ἀρετά seems to mean the two Isthmian hymns as much as the two Isthmian wreaths. And the language of the first, echoing in the poet's thought, influenced the language of the second.

(1) The second hymn like the first is compared to a libation;

IV. 24 μὴ φθόνει κόμπον τὸν ἐοικότ' ἀοιδᾷ
κιρνάμεν ἀντὶ πόνων,
V. 2 δεύτερον κρατῆρα Μοισαίων μελέων
κίρναμεν,

and, in the same connexion, the richness of the feast of song is suggested in the expression

IV. 17 θάλλοισ' ἀρετά

echoing

V. 1 θάλλοντος ἀνδρῶν—συμποσίου.

(2) The hopes of Lampon are thus referred to—

IV. 57 οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι
ἐλπίδων ἔκνισ' ὄπιν.

His hopes were for an Olympian victory, which was not granted, notwithstanding the prayer of Pindar. The phrase recalls the description of the joy of Heracles when the eagle appeared after his prayer:

V. 50 ἀδεία δ' ἔνδον νιν ἔκνιξεν χάρις.

In V. 14 the poet had used τοίαισιν ὀργαῖς of the ambitions of Lampon and his sons; and this seems to be echoed in

IV. 34 ἀλλ' ἐν Οἰνώνᾳ μεγαλήτορες ὀργαί

of 'Aeacus and his sons'[1].

(3) The observations on the career of the man who succeeds in athletic contests in the 1st antistrophos of *Isthmian* IV., resemble both in thought and in language verses in the 1st antistrophos of *Isthmian* V.

IV. 8 κλέος ἔπραξεν ὄντιν' ἀθρόοι στέφανοι
...........ἀνέδησαν...
11 κρίνεται δ' ἀλκὰ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν.
δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαίνοντι τὸν
ἄλπνιστον εὐανθεῖ σὺν ὄλβῳ
14 .................πάντ' ἔχεις
εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν.

[1] See above, p. 81.

16 τὶν δ' ἐν Ἰσθμῷ διπλόα θάλλοισ' ἀρετά.
V. 10 εἰ γάρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάνᾳ τε χαρείς
καὶ πόνῳ πράσσει θεοδμάτους ἀρετάς,
σύν τέ Ϝοι δαίμων φυτεύει δόξαν ἐπήρατον
ἐσχατιὰς ἤδη πρὸς ὄλβου
βάλλετ' ἄγκυραν.
..................................
18 Μοίρας ἐφετμαῖς.

The general idea of both these passages is the same: 'If a man win splendid fame, through divine help, he has attained all that life can give'. The application is somewhat different, according to the circumstances of the case. In the earlier ode one felt that the δόξα ἐπήρατος would hardly be complete until it were crowned by an Olympian victory. In the later ode it is urged that Phylacidas, by his ἀρεταί, has already secured ζωᾶς ἄωτον τὸν ἄλπνιστον,—let him be content. An Olympic crown is not indispensable to happiness:

μὴ μάτευε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι.

(4) Of Lampon's sons it was said in v. 65

τόν τε Θεμιστίου ὀρθώσαντες οἶκον τάνδε πόλιν
θεοφιλῆ ναίοισι.

Since then there had been a more famous 'lifting up', in which a city (for that matter, a nation), not merely a house was involved:

IV. 48 μαρτυρήσαι κεν πόλις Αἴαντος ὀρθωθεῖσα ναύταις.

(5) The paths of fair deeds which mark Aegina's history are prominent in both hymns. We read in

V. 21 τάνδ' ἐπιστείχοντα νᾶσον ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίαις,
μυρίαι δ' ἔργων καλῶν τέτμηνθ' ἑκατόμπεδοι ἐν σχερῷ κέλευθοι.

Similarly in

IV. 21 ...ἔμολον...
τάνδ' ἐς εὔνομον πόλιν. εἰ δὲ τέτραπται
θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἂν καθαρὰν
μὴ φθόνει κόμπον...
25 κιρνάμεν...

The chief difference here is that a million paths are mentioned in the earlier passage, and only one road in the later. But the greatness of the praises of the Aeacids is not forgotten; it is expressed somewhat differently but in an echoing phrase. Reading on a little, we find that the heroes

IV. 27 λόγον ἐκέρδαναν, κλέονται δ'...
μυρίον χρόνον.

(6) The striking expression quoted from Hesiod in *Isth.* V. 66

Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν
ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιόδου μάλα τιμᾷ τοῦτ' ἔπος

is echoed, in a different sense, in *Isth.* IV. 28, where it is said of the heroes

μελέταν δὲ σοφισταῖς
Διὸς ἕκατι πρόσβαλον σεβιζόμενοι.

(7) The praise of the heroes in *Isth.* IV. contains verbal echoes of the account of the Aeacids in *Isth.* V.

V. 27 τὸν χαλκοχάρμαν ἐς πόλεμον
ἄγε...πρόφρονα σύμμαχον ἐς Τρωΐαν...
31 ...πέφνεν δὲ σὺν κείνῳ Μερόπων τ'
ἔθνεα...
IV. 35 ...τοὶ καὶ συμμάχοις [see note]
δὶς πόλιν Τρώων πράθον...
39 ...τίνες Ἕκτορα πέφνον
καὶ στράταρχον...
Μέμνονα χαλκοάραν.

(8) The **κλέος ἥρωος** (the etymon of Ἡρακλέης, in Pindar's eyes), which was prominent in the first ode is echoed in the second:

26 καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταὶ
...........κλέονται.

(9) The phrase used of Menander the trainer in

V. 73 (ἐν ἀεθλήταισιν) χαλκοδάμαντ' ἀκόναν.

may have suggested the unique word applied to Pytheas in IV. 59

αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις.

Any one of these verbal echoes or groups of echoes taken alone would mean nothing. In all Pindar's odes there are resemblances of expression, and the same words and figures constantly recur. But the list just given seems too long to be merely accidental. Without attempting to attach a particular import to any particular echo, we may be disposed to recognize a general significance in the whole series. When Pindar made the second libation, he prayed that the day might come when he should pour a third, to Olympian Zeus. It was decreed that Olympian Zeus was to receive no offering on behalf of Phylacidas; nevertheless the prayer was so far answered that the poet was called upon to pour a third libation. And the significance of all the echoes is to emphasize that the hymn is really the third libation; Phylacidas must not think that he has missed that.

Pindar has carefully sustained his figure. The third libation at a feast was always to Zeus Sôtêr. And accordingly no mention is made of Poseidon in this hymn; it is Zeus throughout[1]. This was the more feasible, because the ode was intended to celebrate a Nemean, as well as the second Isthmian, victory of Phylacidas[2].

The family of Lampon may be well contented (Pindar would say) that it is their privilege to pour out song a third time,

τρίτον σπένδειν μελιφθόγγοις ἀοιδαῖς,

though not to Zeus Olympios, yet to Zeus as a true Saviour (σωτῆρι) and as having shown his mercy very conspicuously of late, on the waters of Salamis, where the Aeginetans had been bravest of all, in the judgment of the Greeks. It might be thought that Zeus had granted the request of the poet really, if not literally.

[1] ll. 14, 29, 49, 52, 53.

[2] See above, p. 80.

# ISTHMIAN IV.

## METRICAL ANALYSIS.

(*Rhythm: dactyloepitritic.*)

### STROPHE.

– ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –
ϖ ⏑ – ⏒ – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ .
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏓
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ .
*v.* 5 – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –
ϖ ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – . – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – ⏒

M. Schmidt proposes a triple mesodic arrangement, in which the first and third groups correspond in the number of beats. Thus:

A (*vv.* 1, 2) = 12 feet
B (*vv.* 3, 5) = 13 feet
A′ (*v.* 6) = 12 feet.

It is to be observed that he interprets the last two syllables of the first verse as trisemoi. For example

| Μᾶτερ | ἀελί- | ου πολυ- | ὤνυμε | Θεί- | α — |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| – ⏑ | – ⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑ ⏑ | – . | – . |

### EPODE.

– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏓
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – .
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ .
– ⏑ – . – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ .
*v.* 5 – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – .
ϖ ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –
– ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – .
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ – .
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ – ⏓

M. Schmidt's scheme is as follows:

A (*vv.* 1, 2) = 5 + 6 = 11
B (*vv.* 3, 4) = 5 + 5 = 10
C (*v.* 5) = 5 = 5
B′ (*vv.* 6, 7) = 5 + 5 = 10
A′ (*vv.* 8, 9) = 6 + 5 = 11

Thus BCB′ may be considered a mesode which is itself mesodic. A pause equivalent to a beat is assumed after the final trisemos of *v.* 4.

## ISTHMIAN V.

### METRICAL ANALYSIS.

(*Rhythm: dactyloepitritic.*)

STROPHE.

– | – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ·
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ ·
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ – –
– ⏑ – ⏖ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –
*v.* 5 – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏓ ·
– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ –
⏕ ⏑ – ⏓ – ⏑ – – ⏖ ⏑ –
– – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏓
– – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – –

M. Schmidt divides the strophe into two parts after the first syllable of *v.* 5, each part consisting of thirty beats. His scheme is:

A (*vv.* 1—4) = 7 · 6 · 4 · 6 · 7 = 30
A′ (*vv.* 5—9) = 4 · 4 · 4 · 6 · 4 · 4 · 4 = 30.

He gets A′ by interpreting the third foot of *v.* 6, and also the fifth foot of *v.* 8, as two trisemoi. To get A he has to assume a pause equivalent to a foot at the beginning of *v.* 1, and a pause of the same kind at the end of *v.* 4; so that in the first case the words θάλλοντος ἀνδρῶν represent four beats:

(– ⏑ –) – – ⏑ – –;

and in the second case the words τὶν ἄωτον δεξάμενοι στεφάνων νῦν represent seven beats:

– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – · (– ⏑ –) –.

EPODE.

– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ·
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – –
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –
– ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – –
*v.* 5 – ⏑ – – – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ·
– | – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏑
– ⏑ – – ⏕ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – · – ⏑ – · – ⏑ – – – ⏑ ⏓

M. Schmidt's scheme is mesodic:

A (*vv.* 1, 2, 3) = (5 + 6 + 7 =) 18 feet
B (*vv.* 4, 5) = (7 + 2 + 7 =) 16 feet,
A′ (*vv.* 6, 7) = (7 + 11 =) 18 feet.

It is to be observed that he takes the last two syllables of *v.* 2 as trisemoi.

# ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙ Δ'.

## ΦΥΛΑΚΙΔΑι ΑΙΓΙΝΗΤΗι

### ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙΩι.

Μᾶτερ Ἀελίου πολυώνυμε Θεία, στρ. α'.
σέο ϝέκατι καὶ μεγασθενῆ νόμισαν
χρυσὸν ἄνθρωποι περιώσιον ἄλλων·

1. **Θεία**] Theia, a divinity whose name is seldom mentioned in extant Greek writings, was, according to the *Theogony* of Hesiod, mother of the Sun and the Moon (ll. 371, 374)

Θεία δ' Ἠέλιόν τε μέγαν λαμπράν τε Σελήνην
γείναθ' ὑποδμηθεῖσ' Ὑπερίονος ἐν φιλότητι.

What the name signifies is uncertain. She is addressed as **πολυώνυμε** as a potent goddess honoured by *many epithets;* not as having many alternative names (though according to Welcker she was also called Chryse, and in Lemnos Athena Chryse, while Boeckh identifies her with Euryphaessa). In *Pyth.* I. 17 πολυώνυμος is applied to Chiron's cave, and can hardly mean more than *famous* (schol. πολυθρύλλητον). In Sophocles, *Antigone* 1115, Dionysus is addressed by this word, which may well refer to his many names (Bacchus, Iacchus, Bromius, Lenaeus, &c.).

2, 3. **σέο ϝέκατι** κ.τ.λ.] *For thy sake men even set a stamp on gold as mighty exceedingly above other things.*—For the digamma of ἕκατι compare *Ol.* XIV. 20 σεῦ ϝέκατι. The MSS. have σέο γ' ἕκατι, but the scholium σοῦ χάριν supports Bergk's correction, which I have adopted (so Fennell).—**μεγασθενής** is an epithet of Poseidon in *Ol.* I. 25, of Zeus of Dodona in *frag.* 57. Pindar has also μεγαλοσθενής.—**νόμισαν** (rare in Pindar), alludes to νόμισμα, *coinage.*—**καί**, not *also*, but *actually.*

On **χρυσόν** there is an interesting scholium:

ἐκ Θείας καὶ Ὑπερίονος Ἥλιος, ἐκ δὲ Ἡλίου ὁ χρυσός. ἑκάστῳ δὲ τῶν ἀστέρων ὕλη τις ἀνάγεται· καὶ Ἡλίῳ μὲν ὁ χρυσός, Σελήνῃ δὲ ὁ ἄργυρος, Ἄρεϊ σίδηρος, Κρόνῳ μόλιβδος, Διὶ ἤλεκτρος, Ἑρμῇ κασσίτερος, Ἀφροδίτῃ χαλκός.

According to this note Theia is connected with gold because she is mother of the Sun. But we must not forget that Pindar was φιλόχρυσος, as another scholium on this verse reminds us; and we may turn to the opening of the First Olympian hymn:

ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ
ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου.

**περιώσιον** (Homeric) is not found else-

*καὶ γὰρ ἐριζόμεναι*
*νᾶες ἐν πόντῳ καὶ ὑφ' ἅρμασιν ἵπποι* 5
*διὰ τεάν, ὦ 'νασσα, τιμὰν ὠκυδινάτοις ἐν ἀμίλλαισι θαυμασταὶ πέλονται·*

*ἔν τ' ἀγωνίοις ἀέθλοισι ποθεινὸν* ἀντ. α'.
*κλέος ἔπραξεν, ὅντιν' ἀθρόοι στέφανοι*
*χερσὶ νικάσαντ' ἀνέδησαν ἔθειραν*
*ἢ ταχυτᾶτι ποδῶν.* 10

where in Pindar. The phrase *περιώσιον ἄλλων* occurs in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, 363.

4 sqq.] *Yes; for thy worth's sake, O queen, both ships vying on the sea approve themselves wonderful; and wonderful, mares yoked to chariots in the swift-whirling ways of battle.*—**καὶ**—**καί**, *both—and*; καὶ γάρ is not equivalent to ἀλλὰ γάρ here, as there is no ellipse in the sense. For **ἐρίζομαι** (=ἐρίζω) see E 172. The reference is to naval battles, not to competition of trading vessels, as is clear from the second clause of the sentence, which refers to battles by land. Wars are undertaken by land and sea, for treasure; and are thus due to the influence of Theia. Pindar's language may seem to suggest battles in olden time when war-chariots were used; but he is probably thinking of contests of his own day, see *Appendix I.*

5. **ὑφ' ἅρμασιν**] B ἐν ἅρμασιν, D ἅρμασιν. Bergk restored ὑφ', which is probably right. *Frag.* 234 decided me to accept his restoration:

ὑφ' ἅρμασιν ἵππος
ἐν δ' ἀρότρῳ βοῦς.

This points to a subtle distinction by which ἐν could be used with ἄροτρον, but not with ἅρμα, to express the relation of the yoked animal. We must remember that ἐν ἅρμασιν was properly used of the charioteer. The omission of the preposition in D is significant, showing that ὑφ' accidentally fell out and that in B its place was supplied by ἐν, suggested by ἐν πόντῳ.

6. **τεὰν τιμάν**] schol. τὸν χρυσόν.—**ὦ 'νασσα**, in Pindar only found here, and *frag.* 205 ὦ 'νασσ' Ἀλάθεια.—**ὠκυδινάτοις**, coined probably for this place. It reminds us of ὠκυπέτης, Homeric attribute of steeds, and ὠκύπορος, Homeric attribute of ships.—**θαυμασταὶ** (ἵπποι as well as νᾶες is feminine) **πέλονται**, schol. θαυμαστοὶ καὶ ἔνδοξοι γίνονται. πέλεσθαι, as often elsewhere in active and in middle, approaches the sense of γίνεσθαι. Compare ὡς δ' ἄφαντος ἔπελες *Ol.* I. 47. **θαυμαστός** here, as usually in Pindar, means *worthy of all admiration.*

7. **ἐν τ'**] διὰ τεὰν τιμάν is carried on. *And it is through thee that in agonistic games sweet glory is won by him, whose hair is bound with sheaves of garlands for victory with strength of hands or swiftness of feet.*—**ποθεινόν**, cp. ποθεινοτάταν δόξαν *Ol.* VIII. 64.—**ἔπραξεν**, used somewhat in the sense of ἐπράξατο. Dissen quotes Euripides, *Orestes* 355 θεόθεν πράξας ἅπερ ηὔχου. The difference between ἔπραξε and ἐπράξατο is that the object of ἔπραξε is conceived as more external than that of ἐπράξατο. πράττειν is *to effect*, πράττεσθαι *to win.* Cp. *Pyth.* II. 40 τὸν δὲ τετράκναμον ἔπραξε δεσμόν, also *Nem.* IX. 3, III. 46.—For **ἀθρόος** in this context see *Isth.* I. 28. The active **ἀναδέω** is used by Pindar in three ways: 1, of the garlands (here); 2, of binding another's hair (*Pyth.* II. 6); 3, of binding one's own hair, like ἀναδέομαι (*Pyth.* X. 40). **ἔθειρα** is not elsewhere found in Pindar.

κρίνεται δ' ἀλκὰ διὰ δαίμονας ἀνδρῶν.
δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον μοῦνα ποιμαίνοντι τὸν ἄλπνιστον εὐανθεῖ
σὺν ὄλβῳ,

εἴ τις εὖ πάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούσῃ. ἐπ. α′.
μὴ μάτευε Ζεὺς γενέσθαι· πάντ' ἔχεις,
εἴ σε τούτων μοῖρ' ἐφίκοιτο καλῶν. 15

11. **κρίνεται κ.τ.λ.**] *The might of men is discerned on account of daemons.* This admits of more than one interpretation. Either (1), as scholiast explains, δοκιμάζεται ἢ χωρίζεται ἡ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀλκὴ τῇ τῶν θεῶν εὐμενείᾳ, and Dissen *reportat victorias per deos;* or (2) as Mezger proposes, 'the trials of men's strength are held on account of the gods', that is the ἀγῶνες, which test men, are celebrated in honour of the gods; or better (3) δαίμων may be a personification of πότμος συγγενής, cp. *Nem.* V. 40. For the δαίμονες of individual men cp. Plato, *Phaedo* 107 d, *Republic* x, 617 e.

12. **δύο κ.τ.λ.**] *Yes, assuredly two things alone, linked with the fair flower of wealth, cherish the most delectable bloom of life, even comfort and a fair name.*—In this sentence the following points are to be observed. (1) δύο μοῦνα is explained by the clause εἴ τις κ.τ.λ., instead of two substantives: this is an instance of the Greek preference for concrete expressions where we use an abstract. (2) σύν connects εὐανθὴς ὄλβος with δύο μοῦνα. τὸ εὖ πάσχειν, as Mezger remarks, presupposes ὄλβος. (3) ποιμαίνοντι (schol. παραθάλπουσι) is used, not ποιμαίνει, because the two things are distinguished. (4) The meaning of ζωᾶς ἄωτον *the fine gloss of life* (cp. εὐζωᾶς ἄωτος *Pyth.* IV. 131, and my note on *Nem.* II. 8) is determined and emphasized by τὸν ἄλπνιστον; standing alone it might suggest little more than 'breath of life'. (5) εὖ πάσχων does not mean *res praeclaras gerens* as Dissen says, but refers to bodily satisfaction. The same two elements of the ideal life are linked in *Pyth.* I. 99, where τὸ εὖ πάσχειν is given the preference:

> τὸ δὲ παθεῖν εὖ πρῶτον ἀέθλων· εὖ
> δ' ἀκούειν δευτέρα μοῖρ'.

—The reading **ἄλπνιστον** has been luckily preserved in the scholia, and this case is an instructive example of the principle that rare words were peculiarly exposed to corruption. The MSS. B and D have ἀνέλπιστον contrary to the metre. Schol.: γράφουσι δὲ ἔνιοι τὸν ἄλπνιστον, τουτέστι τὸν ἥδιστον καὶ προσηνέστατον· ταύτῃ δὲ τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀντιστρόφου φασὶν συνᾴδειν. The rare adjective ἀλπνός occurs also in *Pyth.* VIII. 84 in the compound form ἐπαλπνος (Bergk ἐπ' ἀλπνός).

**ποιμαίνοντι**] suggests in this context a flowery pasture. Cp. the metaphorical use of βουκολῶ, as in *Agam.* 669 ἐβουκολοῦμεν φροντίσιν νέον πάθος, which is appropriate to the picture of the sea as a flowering field (ἀνθοῦν νεκροῖς, l. 659). Cp. also Theocritus, XI. 80 Πολύφαμος ἐποίμαινεν (*was beguiling*) ἔρωτα.

13. **ἀκούσῃ**] B ἀκούῃ.

14. **μάτευε**] Compare *Ol.* V. 24 μὴ ματεύσῃ· θεὸς γενέσθαι.—**πάντ' ἔχεις**, 'it is enough, you have all that you can reasonably seek'.

15. **μοῖρ'**] In the scholia explained by μερίς τις. Perhaps it is rather 'a lot consisting in these fair things'; compare δευτέρα μοῖρ' in *Pyth.* I. 99 (quoted above on l. 12).—ἐφικνέομαι is not found elsewhere in Pindar, nor is it often found in this sense; cp. λ 196 χαλεπὸν δ' ἐπὶ γῆρας ἱκάνει. Usually it means *reach, hit*, and takes the genitive. In Hero-

θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει.
τὶν δ' ἐν Ἰσθμῷ διπλόα θάλλοισ' ἀρετά,
Φυλακίδα, κεῖται, Νεμέᾳ δὲ καὶ ἀμφοῖν
Πυθέᾳ τε παγκρατίου. τὸ δ' ἐμὸν
οὐκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν κέαρ ὕμνων γεύεται· 20
σὺν Χάρισιν δ' ἔμολον Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς

dotus VII. 35 we find a double accusative: ἐπικέσθαι μάστιγι πληγὰς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον.

16. **πρέπει**] *For mortals mortal life is meet.* Elsewhere in Pindar πρέπει (in this sense) is impersonal. Instructive examples of the various ways in which this verb is used may be found in Aeschylus. Cp. *Agam.*, 321, οἶμαι βοὴν ἄμικτον ἐν πόλει πρέπειν, 389, πρέπει φῶς αἰνολαμπὲς σίνος, 1310, ὅμοιος ἀτμὸς ὥσπερ ἐκ τάφου πρέπει, 483, γυναικὸς αἰχμᾷ πρέπει πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος χάριν ξυναινέσαι. The Greek for 'prodigies are the order of the day' would be τέρατα πρέπει.

17. **τὶν δ'** κ.τ.λ.] *For thee, O Phylacidas, at Isthmus hath been set a twofold unfading honour, and at Nemea victory for you both—even for Pytheas with thee—, in the pancration contest.* Four victories are mentioned here; two Isthmian and one Nemean won by Phylacidas, and one Nemean (occasion of Pindar's Fifth Nemean) won by Pytheas.—For **ἀρετά**, not *excellence* but *meed, recompense*, see *Appendix F*; here equivalent to *the honour of victory.* For **θάλλοισα** compare *Ol.* IX. 16 θάλλει δ' ἀρεταῖσιν, and *Isth.* III. B 4 ἀρετὰς—αἶσι θάλλοντες, but it must not be inferred from these passages that θάλλοισα is 'causative'. The ἀρετά is regarded as possessing the quality which it causes. θάλλοισ' ἀρετά suggests the bloom of glory which fadeth not.—**κεῖται**, schol. ἀνάκειται. Compare *Ol.* XIII. 36 ἐπ' Ἀλφεοῦ ῥεέθροισιν αἶγλα ποδῶν ἀνάκειται. The victory is, figuratively, set up in the place where it was won ('der Sieg haftet an dem Ort wo er errungen wurde' Mezger). The expression suggests the dedication of a statue of the victor.

18, 19. **Νεμέᾳ δὲ**] Compare *Isth.* VII. 3 for the dative as locative. The words ἀρετά (not διπλόα ἀρετά) κεῖται are carried on to this second clause. **καὶ ἀμφοῖν**, '*even* for both brothers', not for Phylacidas only.—**Πυθέᾳ τε**, equivalent to τὶν Πυθέᾳ τε in explanation of ἀμφοῖν. τὶν in the preceding line rendered a repetition of this pronoun unnecessary, as it can be supplied from the dual ἀμφοῖν. But though the meaning is perfectly clear, this form of compendious construction is rare. Cp. Soph. *Ajax*, 1312 and *El.* 1416, εἰ γὰρ Αἰγίσθῳ θ' ὁμοῦ (sc. σοί τε); also Aesch. *Supp.* 480:

σὺ μὲν πάτερ γεραιὲ τῶνδε παρθένων,
κλάδους τε τούτους αἶψ' ἐν ἀγκάλαις λαβὼν
βωμοὺς ἐπ' ἄλλους δαιμόνων ἐγχωρίων
θές, ὡς ἴδωσι κ.τ.λ.

where τε links κλάδους with παρθένους understood from the preceding παρθένων.—**παγκρατίου** depends on the notion of victory-crown implied in ἀρετά. Compare *Nem.* V. 5 νίκη παγκρατίου στέφανον, *Isth.* VI. 22 νίκαν παγκρατίου. The victory in the contest and the wreath are conceived as belonging to it.

20. **οὐκ ἄτερ Αἰακιδᾶν**] *My soul is tasting hymns, sweet with the praise of the Aeacids;* 'as I am singing for Aeginetans, I have the pleasure of praising the Aeacidae'. For τὸ ἐμὸν κέαρ compare *Nem.* VII. 102.

21. *At the calling of Lampon's sons I came, with the Charites, to this well-governed city.*—**εὔνομον** is Pindar's praise of a Doric constitution (Mezger).

τάνδ' ἐς εὔνομον πόλιν. εἰ δὲ τέτραπται — στρ. β'.
θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἂν καθαράν,
μὴ φθόνει κόμπον τὸν ἐοικότ' ἀοιδᾷ
κιρνάμεν ἀντὶ πόνων. — 25
καὶ γὰρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταὶ
λόγον ἐκέρδαναν, κλέονται δ' ἔν τε φορμίγγεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε
  παμφώνοις ὁμοκλαῖς

μυρίον χρόνον· μελέταν δὲ σοφισταῖς — ἀντ. β'.

22. **εἰ δὲ τέτραπται** κ.τ.λ.] *But if she* (the city) *has turned her steps along a shining path of heavenly deeds, then grudge not thou to reward her labours by mixing with song the praise befitting.*—The subject of τέτραπται is ἅδε πόλις. Mezger is alone in understanding 'wo man wandelt'. In the scholia a subject is derived from Λάμπωνος υἱοῖς: εἰ δὲ τούτων ὁ βίος καθορᾷ κ.τ.λ. and Kayser (*Lectiones Pind.* p. 92) actually suggests to read Λάμπωνος οἴκῳ. **τέτραπται** expresses not motion, but direction: 'has set her face'. Compare *Ol.* IV. 18 πρὸς Ἁσυχίαν φιλόπολιν καθαρᾷ γνώμᾳ τετραμμένον.—**κέλευθον ἂν καθαράν**, so *Ol.* VI. 23 κελεύθῳ τ' ἐν καθαρᾷ. καθαρός means 'lit by a pure divine light'. Compare *Pyth.* VI. 14 φάει ἐν καθαρῷ, IX. 90 Χαρίτων καθαρὸν φέγγος (*frag.* 142 καθαρὸν ἁμέρας σέλας). If we had to render in Greek the modern idea of 'a light that never was on sea or land', καθαρὸν φέγγος might come in. For **ἂν** see *Appendix H.* With **θεοδότων** (elsewhere in Pindar we meet the form θεόσδοτος) compare above l. 11 διὰ δαίμονας. But the conjunction of **τέτραπται** with **καθαράν**, compared with the similar collocation in the passage cited above from the Fourth Olympian, and the association of both with **θεοδότων**, suggest that all three words have mystical imports. I incline to think that the κέλευθος καθαρά, mentioned here and in *Ol.* VI., is an image borrowed from mysteries.

24. **κόμπον**] See *Isth.* I. 43.—**ἀοιδᾷ** is to be taken with κιρνάμεν, not with ἐοικότα, but there is no reason to regard it, with Mezger, as a dative of place. 'Praise' and 'song' are the two ingredients (corresponding to wine and water) for the mixing-bowl. The use of the dative with a verb of mixing needs no illustration.—Observe that Pindar always has the forms of κίρνημι, never those of κεράννυμι.—The subject of **φθόνει** is the poet, addressed by himself.

26. **καὶ γάρ**] 'Yes, she has her face set that way, of old; *for in the heroic age, too, goodly warriors* (of Aegina) *won the guerdon of fame*'. καὶ γάρ, as often, implies a suppressed sentence. **ἡρώων** is partitive genitive, depending on πολεμισταί. **ἐκέρδαναν** is only here in Pindar, and it is emphatic: the 'gold' which they gained was fame. **λόγον** resumes λόγον ἐσλόν of l. 13.

So **κλέονται** resumes κλέος of l. 8. *And through uncounted time is their glory told on lyres and by the loud calls of full-toned flutes.*—**κλέω** does not occur elsewhere in Pindar. Cp. ν 299 μήτι κλέομαι καὶ κέρδεσιν. Perhaps the verb suggested the use of **ὁμōκλά**, which in Homer always means *a call*, or *a rebuke.* It stands alone in Pindar, who evidently intended ὁμο- to have its etymological force: *concordant.* **πάμφωνος** *omnisonus* is elsewhere used of flutes, *Ol.* VII. 12 φόρμιγγι παμφώνοισί τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν, *Pyth.* XII. 19 αὐλῶν πάμφωνον μέλος.

28. **μελέταν** κ.τ.λ.] *And their divine honours, by grace of Zeus, set a theme for*

ἕκατι πρόσβαλον σεβιζόμενοι.
ἐν Αἰτωλῶν θυσίαισι φαενναῖς 30
ἴδαι κρατεροί,
ἐ Θήβαις ἱπποσόας Ἰόλαος
ς ἔχει, Περσεὺς δ' ἐν Ἄργει, Κάστορος δ' αἰχμὰ Πολυδεύκεος
τ' ἐπ' Εὐρώτα ῥεέθροις·

ἐν Οἰνώνᾳ μεγαλήτορες ὀργαὶ ἐπ. β'.
κοῦ παίδων τε· τοὶ καὶ συμμάχοις 35

*men to work*.—The subject of **πρόσ-** (*addidere*, *procured*, or *caused*) is me as that of κλέονται. For **μελέτα**, *m*, 'subject', cp. *Nem.* VI. 62.—**στής**, *sage*, *wizard*, has not yet got ense which Gorgias and Protagoras for it. Herodotus calls the Seven σοφισταί. Aeschylus applies the to a musician, the author of the *s* (924) to Orpheus. The Scholiast s Sophocles [fr. 820] μέν' εἰς σο-ν ἐμόν. It is hardly necessary to ate Pindar's use of σοφός, which ins his use of σοφιστής here. Cp. IV. 7 εἰ σοφός, εἰ καλός, εἴτις ἀγλαὸς where σοφός means μουσικός, *Nem.* *Pyth.* III. 113, &c.—**σεβίζω** occurs n *Pyth.* V. 80.

ς **ἕκατι** responds to **σέο ϝέκατι** l. 2 ger).

**Οἰνεΐδαι**] Supply γέρας ἔχουσι, the next clause. The sons of Oeneus Tydeus and Meleagros. Elsewhere gh where, we know not) Pindar told Heracles, at the request of Melea-whom he met in Hades, went to Ae-to woo the daughter of Oeneus and led for her sake with her other r Acheloos. (Schol. Iliad Φ 194.)

**ἱπποσόας**] *a speeder*, *or driver of* (*Pyth.* II. 65). Artemis is ἱπποσόα of ἱπποσόος) in *Ol.* III. 26.

**Κάστορος** κ.τ.λ.] *the warrior of Castor and Polydeukes on the ns of Eurotas.* For **ἐπί** cp. *Nem.* ; for **αἰχμά** see *Nem.* X. 23 αἰχμὰν τρύωνος, and cp. Terpander 6 (*P. L.* G. III. p. 12) ἔνθ' αἰχμά τε νέων θάλλει καὶ μῶσα λίγεια (at Lacedaemon).

34. **ἀλλ'** κ.τ.λ.] *But in Oenone the generous spirit of Aeacus and his sons* (*have honour*). **ἀλλά** contrasts the Aeacids with the rest of the list, ll. 30—33, which is strung together by δέ, the Aetolian heroes having μέν because they come first.—**μεγαλήτορες ὀργαί** is a transmuted echo of Homer's μεγαλήτορα θυμόν. **ὀργαί** is perhaps chosen with a purpose; see *Introduction*, p. 81. For *Oenone* cp. *Nem.* IV. 47, VIII. 7 (and my remarks on these passages); also *Isth.* VII. 23.

35. **τοὶ καί**] *who assuredly.* The demonstrative has the force of relative and is best translated so, but, in accordance with its regular Homeric usage, refers to an already defined antecedent, adding a further fact (**καί**).—The reading of the MSS. σὺν μάχαις is translatable, but we may well feel doubts about it. If it is right, the force of σύν is that battles accompanied the taking of Troy; the Aeacids had to fight battles on both expeditions. We may illustrate the force of the preposition by ἔπεφνέ ϝοι σὺν ἀλλαλοφονίᾳ γένος ἀρήιον (*Ol.* II. 42) on the one hand, and σὺν δ' ἀέθλοις ἐκέλευσεν διακρῖναι ποδῶν (*Pyth.* IX. 115) on the other. We should not compare *Pyth.* IV. 203 (σὺν αὔραις) or *Isth.* III. A 1, where σύν must be differently explained.—But it might cross one's mind that the expression, though quite defensible, has little point; and the suspicion must assume a more serious form when we read

*δὶς πόλιν Τρώων πράθον ἑσπόμενοι*
*Ἡρακλῆι πρότερον,*
*καὶ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις. ἔλα νῦν μοι πεδόθεν·*

in the scholia *οἵτινες ταῖς ἑαυτῶν συμμαχίαις τὴν τῶν Τρώων ἐπόρθησαν πόλιν*. This looks as if the commentator had had some part of *σύμμαχος* before him. *σύμμαχοι* would have been really to the point; on both occasions the Aeacids were allies of others. The suspicions are confirmed when we turn to *Isth.* V. 28, and read there *πρόφρονα* **σύμμαχον** of Telamon accompanying Heracles to Troy. In this case emendation is simple and perhaps certain. Pindar wrote

.ΤΟΙ ΚΑΙ CYΜΜΑΧΟΙC

'who twice sacked the city of the Troes for allies'. The construction of **συμμάχοις** (dative of interested persons) was not understood, and hence it was divided into CYΜ ΜΑΧΟΙC, and regarded as a slip in writing for CYΜ ΜΑΧΑΙC. But the true reading was also preserved in the text which Didymus used. This is one of the clearest instances where the vestiges of a superior reading are preserved in the scholia. (These vestiges led Friese, *Pindarica*, p. 15 to the unlucky guess *συμμάχαις*, an impossible word.)

36. **ἑσπόμενοι**] Pindar also uses the unreduplicated form *σπομέναν*. **δίς**, cp. Propertius III. 1, 32 Troia bis Oetaei numine capta dei, Homer, E 638 *sqq*.

37. Observe that the last syllable of Ἡρᾰκλῆῐ is lengthened before *πρ*.

38. **καὶ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις**] Schol. *πάλιν δὲ τῷ συλληπτικῷ τρόπῳ κέχρηται· οὐ γὰρ οἱ αὐτοὶ δὶς ἐπόρθησαν τὴν Ἴλιον ἀλλὰ Τελαμὼν μὲν σὺν Ἡρακλεῖ, Νεοπτόλεμος δὲ σὺν Ἀτρείδαις*. In the actual sack of Troy the Aeacid concerned was Neoptolemus; but Pindar does not exclude Achilles who helped so much to bring it about.

**ἔλα**] For the imperative cp. above l. 24; for *ἐλάω* cp. *Nem.* III. 74; for the meaning (intransitive, *move, drive*) compare Tyrtaeus, 11, 10 *ἀμφοτέρων δ' εἰς κόρον ἠλάσατε*, Plato *Gorgias*, 486 A &c. The usage has been variously explained as a metaphor from driving horses, or from ships (cp. schol. *ἢ ἔλα κατὰ μεταφορὰν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν*), but it seems better to refer it to the same original meaning of *ἐλαύνω* which made the verb applicable both to ships and to cars, and to other things as well.—**πεδόθεν** is generally said to mean 'from the beginning', properly 'from the ground' (in one scholium we have *ἐκ ῥιζῶν*, *radicitus*, and also *ἀρξάμενος ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς*). It occurs in another passage in Pindar, *Ol.* VII. 62 *ὁρᾶν ἔνδον θαλάσσας αὐξομέναν πεδόθεν πολύβοσκον γαῖαν*, where it clearly means 'from the ground' at the bottom of the sea. In Hesiod, *Theogony* 680 *πεδόθεν δ' ἐτινάσσετο μακρὸς Ὄλυμπος* means 'Olympus was shaken from its base'. In *v.* 295 we have *οἵ τοι πεδόθεν φίλοι εἰσίν*, where *πεδόθεν* is explained 'from the bottom of the heart'. Compare some usages of German *gründlich*, *funditus*. But the present passage seems to demand a somewhat different meaning, and a different meaning is given to us by one of the scholiasts. We look for a word meaning 'straight on', and the longest scholium (doubtless derived from Didymus) begins thus: *ἔλα νῦν μοι, ὦ Μοῦσα, ἐπ' εὐθείας ὁδοῦ καὶ δι' ὁμαλοῦ· τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ πεδόθεν*. This explanation points to some other use of *πεδόθεν* than that which belongs to it in the passages just quoted. But it certainly does not justify the interpretation of Mezger that *ἔλα πεδόθεν* is to be taken like the Homeric *πεδίοιο διώκειν*. Such a use of a form in *-θεν* we may safely rule to be impossible. On the other hand one is tempted to suspect that *πεδόθεν* may be

λέγε, τίνες Κύκνον, τίνες Ἕκτορα πέφνον,
καὶ στράταρχον Αἰθιόπων ἄφοβον 40
Μέμνονα χαλκοάραν· τίς ἄρ' ἐσλὸν Τήλεφον
τρῶσεν ἑῷ δορὶ Καΐκου παρ' ὄχθαις;

τοῖσιν Αἴγιναν προφέρει στόμα πάτραν στρ. γ'.
διαπρεπέα νᾶσον· τετείχισται δὲ πάλαι
πύργος ὑψηλαῖς ἀρεταῖς ἀναβαίνειν. 45

akin to Aeolic πεδά, which, with the accusative, means *after*. Thus πεδόθεν might have something of the force of ἑξῆς, 'next in order'.—M. Schmidt proposed σπιδόθεν (=μακρόθεν).

39. **λέγε**] The Muse is bidden say, who slew Cycnus, Hector, Memnon, and wounded Telephus? The answer comes in *v.* 43, but in a general form; Achilles, the slayer or wounder of all four, is not mentioned by name, as he is in *Ol.* II. 79 sqq. where we have the same catalogue, except Telephus.—Κύκνος, son of Poseidon. The penult is long here, but in *Ol.* II. 82 it is short.

40. **στράταρχον**] It is worthy of remark that this word which, as far as I know, is used by no other writer, occurs in Pindar twice as the title of the legendary chief of the Ethiopians. See *Pyth.* VI. 31 ἐναρίμβροτον ἀναμείναις στράταρχον Αἰθιόπων Μέμνονα. In *Nem.* III. 62 Memnon is κοίρανος. Herodotus has στρατάρχης twice, once of the wily Zopyros who was elected by the men of Babylon to be their στρατάρχης and τειχοφύλαξ in their revolt against Darius (III. 157), and once of Ion (VIII. 44) where the word is clearly chosen to avoid the term βασιλεύς, as the old Attic legend left no room for Ion among the kings who succeeded Cecrops. Pindar used στράταρχος 'leader of an army' as a word free from technical associations, just as he sometimes has ἀρχός when a prose writer would use βασιλεύς or τύραννος. It is to be observed that στρατηγός is not found in his extant works.

41. **χαλκοάραν**] The Homeric form is χαλκήρης. See *Isth.* III B 63.—MSS. τίς γάρ corrected by Schmid.—'The good Telephus' was king of Mysia. Achilles wounded him, but he was healed. He also appears in *Ol.* IX. 72.

42. **Καΐκου**] According to the metre of this passage the first syllable of the Mysian river is long; but it ought to be short, cp. Hesiod, *Theogony* 343

> Πηνειόν τε καὶ Ἕρμον ἐΰρρείτην τε Κάϊκον.

It would be rash however to meddle with the text; the quantities of proper names sometimes vary. Hermann proposed ᾧ δορὶ τρῶσε παρ' ὄχθαισιν Καΐκου, but this is to rewrite Pindar. Bergk objects to ἑῷ (he would prefer ἑλών); but compare below V. 33 σφετέρας νευρᾶς.

43. **τοῖσιν** κ.τ.λ.] The Muse makes answer: 'They whose mouth utters "Aigina" as the name of their land, the illustrious island'. **τοῖσιν**, as Mr Fennell says, is to be taken both with στόμα and with πάτραν. προφέρει, *eloquitur*. **πάτραν** is the predicate; **διαπρεπέα** (here trisyllabic) **νᾶσον** qualifies **Αἴγιναν**. (In *Ol.* I. 2 we have διαπρέπω.)

44. **τετείχισται** κ.τ.λ.] **πάλαι** is emphatic. *Yea, of old a tower has been embattled with high excellences, for the folk of that land to climb.* In two other Pindaric passages we find τειχίζω figuratively used, in *Pyth.* VI. 9 of a treasure house of songs, ὕμνων θησαυρὸς τετείχισται, and *fr.* 194, *v.* 2 τειχίζωμεν κόσμον αὐδάεντα λόγων.—**ἀρεταῖς**, such as the 'god-built excellences' of V. 11.

*πολλὰ μὲν ἀρτιεπὴς*
*γλῶσσά μοι τοξεύματ' ἔχει περὶ κείνων*
*κελαδέειν· καὶ νῦν ἐν* Ἄρει *μαρτυρῆσαι κεν πόλις* Αἴαντος
*ὀρθωθεῖσα ναύταις*

*ἐν πολυφθόρῳ* Σαλαμὶς Διὸς *ὄμβρῳ* — *ἀντ. γ'.*
*ἀναρίθμων ἀνδρῶν χαλαζάεντι φόνῳ.* — 50

46. **πολλὰ μέν**] **μέν** is taken up not by *δέ* but by the more emphatically adversative *ἀλλά* in l. 51.—**ἀρτιεπής**, speaking to the point, not inarticulately; compare *Ol.* VI. 61, *ἀντεφθέγξατο δ' ἀρτιεπὴς πατρία ὄσσα*. The force of *ἄρτιος* is seen in *ἄρτια βάζειν* (Ξ 92), *οἱ φρεσὶν ἄρτια ᾔδη* (Ε 326). In Hesiod (*Theogony* 29) the Muses are *ἀρτιέπειαι*. The word easily passed into a meaning which was hardly complimentary; see Χ 281 where a schol. explains *ἄρτιος καὶ ἱκανὸς εἰπεῖν ὥστε πιστεύεσθαι*. It strikes one that Pindar may have intended to suggest the artistic structure of his verses (*ἔπη*), as well as the fitness of his diction. We read of smiths joining (*ἅρμοσαν*) *ἔπη* in *Pyth.* III. 114.

48. **κελαδέειν**] Boeckh's correction of *κελαδεῖν* (MSS.). We might expect a word of shooting or hurling with the metaphorical *τοξεύματα*; but it was a Greek habit to soften metaphors by reverting to the literal fact. It would be quite in Pindar's manner to write *τοξεύματα κελαδεννά*; but here he uses the infinitive instead of the adjective. *Many arrows hath my tongue, for loud utterance in song concerning them.* Cp. Terpander, 5 *ἑπτατόνῳ φόρμιγγι νέους κελαδήσομεν ὕμνους*. The infinitive gives the use to which the darts are to be put. Cp. *Oed. Rex*, 198 *τελεῖν γάρ, εἴ τι νὺξ ἀφῇ, τοῦτ' ἐπ' ἦμαρ ἔρχεται*.—Bergk's *κελαρύσαι* (adopted by Christ) has not the slightest probability.—**περὶ κείνων** refers to the Aeginetans, implied in *Αἴγιναν*, l. 43.

**καὶ νῦν** *κ.τ.λ.*] A recent event—one battlement more for the tower—presents a new mark for an arrow. *Even now in the matter of War the city of Ajax, Salamis, could testify that she was kept from falling by the Sailors, in the ruinous storm of Zeus, when the blood of countless men was shed like hail.* **πόλις.** The town of Salamis was on the east side of the island. **ὀρθωθεῖσα,** schol. *ἀνορθωθεῖσα ἐκ τῶν κινδύνων τοῖς Αἰγινήταις κατὰ τὴν ναυμαχίαν ἀριστεύσασιν*.—Hartung has put forward objections to *ναύταις*, which, according to him, absolutely requires a predicate, either *Aeginetan* or *brave*, and he holds that one or both of these qualifications was read by the scholiast who wrote *τῇ τῶν Αἰγινητῶν ἀρετῇ*. Accordingly he suggests *ἀρείοις* for *ἐν Ἄρει*. This is hardly a safe way of using the scholia. It seems to me that there is far more gained by the unqualified *ναύταις* than if it had ever so many attributes or predicates. The men of Aegina are not merely 'Aeginetan sailors' or 'warlike sailors', but the *Sailors* of Greece,—the chief sea-power of older Hellas.

49. **πολυφθόρῳ**] Compare *Nem.* VIII. 31. **Διὸς ὄμβρῳ**, an Homeric expression (Ε 91) of a violent storm; here figurative of war (schol. *ὄμβρον μὲν τὸν πόλεμον εἴρηκεν, οἷον τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καταπεμφθέντα διὰ τὸ τῆς βαρβαρικῆς στρατιᾶς πλῆθος*). The metaphor is carried on and made more realistic by **χαλαζάεντι φόνῳ**. Did Pindar coin *χαλαζάεις*? Empedocles uses *χαλαζώδης*. Compare *χάλαζαν αἵματος* *Isth.* VI. 27.

50. **ἀναρίθμων**] The following scholium points to a variant *ἰσαρίθμων*: (Abel

*ἀλλ' ὅμως καύχημα κατάβρεχε σιγᾷ·*
*Ζεὺς τά τε καὶ τὰ νέμει,*
*Ζεὺς ὁ πάντων κύριος. ἐν δ' ἐρατεινῷ*
*μέλιτι καὶ τοιαίδε τιμαὶ καλλίνικον χάρμ' ἀγαπάζοντι. μαρνάσθω*
*τις ἔρδων*

p. 438) ὁ δὲ νοῦς· ἐν ᾧ, ἐν τῷ πολυφθόρῳ πολέμῳ, τὸ τῶν πεπτωκότων πλῆθος ἰσάριθμον ἦν τῷ χαλαζῆεντι Διὸς ὄμβρῳ. The construction implied in this note is ἐν πολυφθόρῳ φόνῳ ἀνδρῶν ἰσαρίθμων χαλαζάεντι Διὸς ὄμβρῳ. Both Hermann and Hartung jumped at ἰσάριθμον. The former suggested both συναρίθμων and ἰσάριθμ' ἀνέρων. Hartung proposed ἰσαρίθμων, placing a comma after ἀνδρῶν, thus: Διὸς ὄμβρῳ ἰσαρίθμων ἀνδρῶν, χαλαζάεντι φόνῳ. Kayser also approved of ἰσαρίθμων. It will be generally agreed that the reading of the MSS. (supported by another scholium, Abel, p. 437) is far superior. The box-within-box-like expression which the reading ἰσαρίθμων gives us may recommend itself to a German, as something familiar; but it is not in Pindar's style, and in any Greek author would be intolerably awkward.

51. **ἀλλ'** κ.τ.λ.] 'Yet, great though it be, whelm a boast in the waters of silence': schol. βρέχε καὶ ἐπικάλυπτε τῇ σιώπῃ διὰ τὸν ἔξωθεν φθόνον. Compare *frag.* 240, σιγᾷ βρεχέσθω (also *frag.* 180). We read of a different sort of 'whelming' in *Ol.* X. 99, μέλιτι εὐάνορα πόλιν καταβρέχων. — **καύχημα**, only here in classical Greek. **καύχα** occurs in *Nem.* IX. 7.

52. **Ζεὺς** κ.τ.λ.] *of divers sorts are the dispensings of Zeus, Zeus who is lord of all.* This consideration is a reason for silence. Cp. *Pyth.* V. 55, and Homer ζ 188 νέμοι ὄλβον Ὀλύμπιος ἀνθρώποισιν.— —For **τὰ καὶ τά** *these things and those,* here 'good and bad luck', see my note on *Nem.* I. 30. The MSS. have τάδε καὶ τά, the restoration is due to Boeckh.— The parenthetical reference to Salamis, begun with καὶ νῦν l. 48, closes at κύριος.

53. **ἐν δ' ἐρατεινῷ** κ.τ.λ.] This δ' balances μέν in l. 46. 'I have many matters for praise; but among them, and specially claiming me now, are agonistic victories'.—The general meaning of this sentence is clear enough: 'victors like an epinician hymn'; but it is an old question, as old at least as the scholiasts, whether ΤΟΙΑΙΔΕ ΤΙΜΑΙ is dative singular or nominative plural. If the former (1) the words are explained: ἐν τοιούτῳ μέλιτι καὶ ἡδονῇ ὄντες καὶ τοιαύτῃ τιμῇ τὸ ἐπίνικον χάρμα ἀγαπῶσιν, ὅ ἐστι τὸν ὕμνον. Bergk and Christ adopt this reading (τοιᾷδε τιμᾷ) and Hartung approves. But it may be urged against this view that the absence of an expressed subject to ἀγαπάζοντι is harsh, and that it is not in Pindar's manner to set coordinate the metaphor and the literal phrase. (2) τοιαίδε τιμαί, which other editors adopt from the MSS., gives the required nominative to ἀγαπάζοντι, gives a pointed sense to καί, and brings the whole clause into fitting contrast with the μέν clause of l. 46 *sqq.* **ἐν ἐρατεινῷ μέλιτι** is further contrasted with **ἐν Ἄρει** l. 48; victory in war may be pleasant, but it would be unfitting to call it *honey*; that is for milder triumphs. The meaning is: 'Passing from war to delights which are not bitter, such honours also as these of Lampon's sons are fain of the glad song of victory'.

For **τοιαίδε** compare *Isth.* III B. 27.— **χάρμα** means simply *joy*; **καλλίνικον** determines it to be the glad song of victory; cp. *Isth.* I. 2, *Nem.* IV. 16. Dissen takes χάρμα with ἐν μέλιτι, explaining χάρμα μελιτόεν.

54. **μαρνάσθω** κ.τ.λ.] For **μάρναμαι** of strife in games compare *Nem.* V. 47

*ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισιν γενεὰν Κλεονίκου* ἐπ. γ'. 55
*ἐκμαθών· οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρὸς*
*μόχθος ἀνδρῶν· οὐδ' ὁπόσαι δαπάναι*
*ἐλπίδων ἔκνισ' ὄπιν.*
*αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις*

*χαίρω δ' ὅτι ἐσλοῖσι μάρναται πέρι πᾶσα πόλις.* The use of **ἔρδων** without an object is illustrated by *Nem.* VII. 11 *εἰ δὲ τύχῃ τις ἔρδων* (and *Ol.* X. 91 *εἰ δὲ θεὸν ἀνήρ τις ἔλπεται λελαθέμεν ἔρδων*), where *ἔρδειν* means to exert oneself to achieve agonistic exploits. Thus *μαρνάσθω ἔρδων ἀμφ' ἀέθλοισι* is 'let a man work with a will in the field of athletic rivalry',—**ἐκμαθὼν γενεὰν Κλεονίκου** 'when he has fully learned the lesson of the race of Cleonicus', that is, when he has experienced in the pancration what manner of men the sons of Lampon are. One must exert oneself in sober truth to win a prize from them. It is not for nothing that Pindar chooses the name of the grandfather to designate the grandchildren. *Kleonikos* is, as Dissen remarked, 'suaviter hic nominatus propter significationem victoriarum quae in nomine inest'. There is, as it were, a second intention; the rival of Pytheas and Phylacidas must truly master the art of *winning victories.*—For *ἀμφί* cp. *Isth.* VII. 30.

56. **οὔτοι** κ.τ.λ.] *Long has the strain been; yet the labour of these men has assuredly never been dimmed.* This is the force of **μακρός** (*καίπερ μακρὸς ὤν*). The metaphor of dim sight seems to have been suggested by the name of *Λάμπων*. Schol. *οὐδὲ ὁ μόχθος αὐτῶν τετύφλωται ἀλλὰ ὀξυδερκεῖ καὶ ἔχει καλὰ ἀποτελέσματα.* The same tense of *τυφλοῦν* occurs in *Ol.* XII. 9. **ἀνδρῶν** refers to *γενεὰν Κλεονίκου.*

57. **οὐδ' ὁπόσαι** κ.τ.λ.] *Nor did the sum of all their outlay on hopes impair the view of their piety.* The metaphor from vision is still carried on. **ὄπιν,** which means *pious* or *religious care* (here in regard to the festivals of the gods), is chosen for the sake of its supposed etymological connection with *ὄψομαι, ὄψις, ὄππα.* **κνίζω** suggests the irritation of the eye, to the hurt of its sight, schol. *ἐλύπησαν.*—In regard to the construction, we might look for *ἔκνισαν*, and we may call *ἔκνισ'* a *Πινδαρικὸν σχῆμα* (with the scholiast) if we will; but we must recognise that it is not a pronounced case. The conception is pointedly singular, 'the sum of the expenses'. Compare the defensible form of speech 'two and three is five'.—**ἐλπίδων** is pregnant; hopes that were never fulfilled. For the reference see above *Introduction*, p. 85. The genitive is possessive; the expenses, caused by the hopes, are conceived as belonging to them.

For *ὄπιν* Aristarchos strangely read *ὀπί* and explained *ἔκνισ'* as first person: *οὐδὲ ἐλύπησα τῇ φωνῇ ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον ὕμνησα αὐτούς.*

59. **αἰνέω** κ.τ.λ.] In considering this passage, which has caused commentators a great deal of trouble, two points must be observed, to begin with. The first is that *εὐθυπορῆσαι* cannot depend on *αἰνέω*, because neither *αἰνέω* nor *ἐπαινέω* is constructed with the accusative and infinitive; and the second that *ἐν γυιοδάμαις* is not to be joined with *χερσί* (as Hermann and Dissen thought), which comes so much later. These two premises, if we hold fast to them, take us a long way. It follows that (1) *εὐθυπορῆσαι* depends on *δεξιόν*, as there is nothing else for it to depend on; and (2) that *χερσί* is instrumental with *εὐθυπορῆσαι*—giving us just the qualification that we should expect of the metaphor from running. It is easy to see the con

Φυλακίδᾳ πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι 60
χερσὶ δεξιὸν νόῳ ἀντίπαλον.
λάμβανέ Ϝοι στέφανον, φέρε δ' εὔμαλλον μίτραν,
καὶ πτερόεντα νέον σύμπεμψον ὕμνον.

struction and the meaning now. **πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι χερσὶ δεξιὸν νόῳ** is a highly elaborate expression for 'skilful in the pancration'; the case of Φυλακίδᾳ is determined by ἀντίπαλον, *a match for;* and the compliment to Pytheas is that he is as skilful a pancratiast as his brother. **ἐν γυιοδάμαις**, *among limb-quellers*, is a sought expression for ἐν παγκρατιασταῖς. The whole sentence may be reproduced thus:

*I praise Pytheas too* (as well as his brother) *among pancratiast heroes as peer of Phylacidas in science and skill to drive blows straight to the goal in the race with hands.*

The passage has been misconstrued owing to the idea that Pytheas acted as trainer or 'coach' of his brother. Thus Φυλακίδᾳ was taken as Dative of the person benefiting. I have given some of the various views in *Appendix* G.—For the form **γυιοδάμας** cp. *Isth.* v. 73. For **εὐθυπορῆσαι** with cognate object cp. *Ol.* VII. 91 ὁδὸν εὐθυπορεῖ.—Φυλακίδα B; Φυλακίδαν D; Φυλακίδᾳ Schmid.

61. **χερσί**] In the 'race' of the pancration hands take the place of feet.—D has νόων.

62, 63. **λάμβανε** κ.τ.λ.] Here again the imperative is addressed to the Muse (or the poet). *Take a crown for him, and take a headband of fair wool; and with these send the new winged song.* **Ϝοι** for Pytheas; he is to be crowned too, in memory of his elder Nemean victory. The Muse, who bears the new hymn to Phylacidas, is to bear too, figuratively, a wreath and band for Pytheas; that is, without metaphor, the foregoing words of praise (l. 59—61).—**εὔμαλλον** is ἅπαξ εἰρημένον. **μίτραν**, the woollen band on which the leaves of a wreath are strung. Compare *Nem.* VIII. 15.—**νέον** (D νόον), in contrast with *Isthmian* v. For **πτερόεντα** cp. above *Isth.* I. 64.—**σύμπεμψον**, with the στέφανος and μίτρα.

## ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙ Ε'.

## ΦΥΛΑΚΙΔΑι ΑΙΓΙΝΗΤΗι

### ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙΩι.

Θάλλοντος ἀνδρῶν ὡς ὅτε συμποσίου — στρ. α'.
δεύτερον κρατῆρα Μοισαίων μελέων

1. **θάλλοντος** κ.τ.λ.] 'Like banqueters at the height of the revel, we are blending a second blending-bowl of divine music (lit. *muse-made lyrics*), to celebrate Lampon's prize-winning son; our first was mixed for thee, O Zeus, at Nemea, where we received the fairest of crowns, while now we mix for the lord of Isthmus and the fifty Nereids, Phylacidas, the youngest son, being victor'.

**θάλλοντος συμποσίου**, a transfigured echo of the Homeric δαῖτα θάλειαν (or εἰλαπίνην τεθαλυῖαν). But **θάλλοντος** has its full participial meaning and is well explained by the scholiast ὥσπερ ἀκμάζοντος φησὶ συμποσίου καὶ δεύτερον κρητῆρα κ.τ.λ. **ἀνδρῶν** depends on συμποσίου.—With **ὡς ὅτε** the verb is, as usual, suppressed, being easily understood from the correlative clause; here we supply κεράννυσί τις. δεύτερον κρατῆρα is the object both of this understood verb and of κίρναμεν. Thus the construction is ὡς ὅτε, θάλλοντος συμποσίου ἀνδρῶν, κεράννυσί τις δεύτερον κρατῆρα, (ὧς καὶ ἡμεῖς) δεύτερον κρατῆρα κίρναμεν. For this idiomatic use of ὡς ὅτε cp. *Nem.* IX. 16 Ἐριφύλαν, ὅρκιον ὡς ὅτε πιστόν, δόντες, understand δίδωσί τις, *Pyth.* XI. 40 ἤ μέ τις ἄνεμος ἔξω πλόου ἔβαλεν, ὡς ὅτ' ἄκατον εἰναλίαν, understand βάλλει ἔξω πλόου, see also *Ol.* VI. 2.—**συμποσίου** occurs also in *Nem.* IX. 48, *Ol.* VII. 5, but συμποσία *Pyth.* IV. 294.

2. **δεύτερον κρατῆρα**] In regard to the three libations, I cannot do better than quote the scholia (p. 445, ed. Abel).

[l. 3] ὁ πρῶτος οὖν κρατὴρ Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου, ὁ δεύτερος Γῆς καὶ ἡρώων, ὁ τρίτος Διὸς σωτῆρος.

[l. 7] τὸν δε τρίτον κρατῆρα Διὸς σωτῆρος ἔλεγον, καθὰ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ναυπλίῳ (*fr.* 389, Nauck)

> Ζεῦ πανσίλυπε καὶ Διὸς σωτηρίου
> σπονδὴ τρίτου κρατῆρος.

τὸν μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου ἐκίρνασαν, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον ἡρώων, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Διὸς σωτῆρος. καθὰ καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ἐπιγόνοις (*fr.* 54 Nauck)

> λοιβὰς Διὸς μὲν πρῶτον ὡραίου γάμου
> Ἥρας τε.

εἶτα

> τὴν δευτέραν γε κρᾶσιν ἥρωσιν νέμω·

εἶτα

> τρίτον Διὸς σωτῆρος εὐκταίαν λίβα

......ἔλεγον δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ τέλειον διὰ τὸ τέλειον εἶναι τὸν τρίτον ἀριθμὸν ἀρχὴν ἔχοντα καὶ μέσον καὶ τέλος.

The scholiast clearly believed that the

κίρναμεν Λάμπωνος εὐάθλου γενεᾶς ὕπερ, ἐν Νεμέᾳ μὲν πρῶτον, ὦ Ζεῦ,
τὶν ἄωτον δεξάμενοι στεφάνων,

second libation was regularly offered to heroes or tò the Earth and heroes. It seems more likely, that while the first and third libations were fixed by an invariable custom, the nature of the second was decided by the occasion. Here, for example, the metaphorical κρατὴρ is mixed for Poseidon and the Nereids. We may suspect that the scholiast generalized from the passage of Aeschylus.—Cp. *Agam.* 245 τριτόσπονδον παιᾶνα, and 1386 τρίτην ἐπενδίδωμι τοῦ κατὰ χθονὸς Αἴδου νεκρῶν σωτῆρος εὐκταίαν χάριν.

**Μοισαίων** (Heyne; MSS. Μοισέων); cp. Μοισαῖον λίθον *Nem.* VIII. 47, Μοισαῖον ἅρμα *Isth.* VII. 67

3. **εὐάθλου**] only here in Pindar. **γενεᾶς**, like *progenies*, 'son'; cp. *Pyth.* IV. 136 Τυροῦς γενεά = Pelias.

**ἐν Νεμέᾳ μὲν πρῶτον**, opposed to δεύτερον aforegoing. This is an interesting instance of the inversion of the μέν and δέ clauses, involving the omission of δέ altogether. ἐν Νεμέᾳ δέ might have been written, but μέν is a kind of rectification, showing the poet's consciousness that he is inverting the natural order. The δέ clause is continued in l. 5 with νῦν αὖτε *sqq.*, where Ἰσθμοῦ corresponds to ἐν Νεμέᾳ, but it seems to be an incomplete view of the whole sentence to say that νῦν αὖτε takes the place of νῦν δέ.—**πρῶτον**, the victory won by Pytheas, and celebrated in the Fifth Nemean ode. (1) The scholiast understands κρατῆρα with πρῶτον: δεξάμενοι τὸ ἄνθος τῶν στεφάνων ἐν Νεμέᾳ, σοὶ ὦ Ζεῦ πρῶτον κίρναμεν κρατῆρα. We should have in this case to understand the participle κεράσαντες from the foregoing κίρναμεν; 'At Nemea, O Zeus, having mixed the first (bowl) in thy honour, having there received a wreath of victory'. (2) Modern commentators take πρῶτον with ἄωτον and τίν with δεξάμενοι, 'At Nemea having received at thy hands, O Zeus, a first fair crown'.—Against (1) it may be urged that it is harsh to separate πρῶτον from ἄωτον, when we have at the same time to understand both κρατῆρα and κεράσαντες. Against (2) it may be objected that, as Ἰσθμοῦ δεσπότᾳ clearly depends on κίρναμεν (not on δεξάμενοι), the figure is somewhat roughly interrupted if there is no mention or at least suggestion of the mixing bowl in the clause referring to the first 'libation'. Thus we require the meaning of (1) and the construction of (2).

Perhaps Pindar has combined these two requirements by his choice of the word ἄωτος, which he seldom uses without some significance (see note on *Nem.* II. 9, and *Appendix* A, notes 2, 3 in my ed. of the *Nemean Odes*). May it here suggest *a bowl with ears* or *handles* (οὔατα), as if compounded of ἀ (copulativum) and οὖς; cp. ἀμφωτίς? Thus the words would mean that at Nemea the poet received a bowl to mix in honour of Zeus —the first libation of Lampon's house.

4. **τίν**] *In thy honour*, not *from thee*. It is quite true that δέκομαι is often used by Pindar with the dative of the giver; but I would contend that in no case is the dative equivalent to παρά with the genitive. In *Ol.* XIII. 29 Xenophon offers the hymn of praise to Olympian Zeus:

δέξαι τέ ϝοι στεφάνων ἐγκώμιον τεθμόν.

In *Pyth.* VIII. 5, the glory of a Pythian victory is presented by Aristomenes to Hasychia:

Πυθιόνικον τιμὰν Ἀριστομένει δέκευ.

In *Pyth.* XII. Midas presents his wreath to Acragas:

δέξαι στεφάνωμα τόδ' ἐκ Πυθῶνος εὐδόξῳ Μίδᾳ.

Now in all three cases the dative is clearly

*νῦν αὖτε Ἰσθμοῦ δεσπότᾳ* 5
*Νηρεΐδεσσί τε πεντήκοντα παίδων ὁπλοτάτου*
*Φυλακίδα νικῶντος. εἴη δὲ τρίτον*

that of the person interested. The force of *δέξαι τέ ϝοι* is not 'receive from him' but 'honour him by receiving'; *δέξαι Μίδᾳ* is 'receive, to please Midas'. The dative of interest is obviously the right explanation in *frag.* 133, l. 1:

*οἶσι δὲ Φερσεφόνα ποινὰν παλαιοῦ Πενθέος*
*δέξεται, κ.τ.λ.*

The last case is *Pyth.* IV. 21

*θεῷ ἀνέρι ϝειδομένῳ γαῖαν διδόντι*
*ξείνια πρῴραθεν Εὔφαμος καταβὰς*
*δέξατ'.*

Here the point of the dative is to bring out the fact that Euphamos was complying with the wishes of the god, rendered emphatic by *διδόντι*. *θεῷ* is much more than *παρὰ θεοῦ*.—Doubts have been felt about **τῒν** in this place, for, though Theocritus has *τῒν* (cp. *τεΐν*), this form of the dative is short in the only other passages in Pindar where it precedes a vowel (*Pyth.* I. 29 *εἴη Ζεῦ τὶν εἴη ἁνδάνειν*, *Nem.* x. 30 *πὰν δὲ τέλος ἐν τὶν ἔργων*. We may leave aside the very doubtful *Pyth.* VIII. 68, where *κατὰ τὶν* is a correction of Pauw, the MSS. having *τιν'*). It seems to me that two cases of *τῐν* are not strong enough to throw doubt on one case of *τῑν*. The most reasonable view seems to be that *τῑν* was the usual quantity (cp. *ὑμῖν*), and that in the numerous cases where *τὶν* occurs before consonants, (*τὶν δέ, τὶν γάρ* &c.) always emphatic, we should read it so. *τῐν* was a variant like *ὑμῐν* which might be employed when there was no special emphasis required. In the present case *τὶν* is strongly accentuated and placed in an emphatic position at the beginning of the verse. This stress by position enables us to dispense with Pauw's insertion *γ'* (*τίν γ'*), adopted by many editors.

5. **νῦν αὖτε**] MSS. *νῦν αὖτ' ἐν Ἰσθμοῦ δεσπότα* (B, but D *δέσποτα*). The accent preserved in B betrays the original form *δεσπότᾳ*, which was read by the scholiasts. In the scholia we find evidence of two different readings. (1) Abel p. 445 (on this passage) *νῦν δὲ νικήσαντος ἐν Ἰσθμῷ, τουτέστι τὰ Ἴσθμια, τοῦ νεωτέρου Φυλακίδου, τῷ δεσπότῃ αὐτοῦ Ποσειδῶνι καὶ ταῖς Νηρεΐσι κίρναμεν τὸν δεύτερον κρατῆρα.* This points to the reading

*νῦν αὖτ' ἐν Ἰσθμῷ δεσπότᾳ.*

(2) p. 427 (Introduction to this Ode, V according to the scholiast's numbering), this line is quoted (in D):

*νῦν αὖτε Ἰσθμοῦ δεσπότᾳ.*

The MSS. shew a confusion of both these readings; and it seems clear that *ἐν Ἰσθμῷ* is due to a desire for symmetry with *ἐν Νεμέᾳ*. I therefore believe (with Hermann) that (2) is right; and indeed, even without the help of the scholia, this reading would have been the most reasonable inference from the text of the MSS. Boeckh read *αὖτις* to avoid the hiatus. But this passage and *Isth.* I. 9 *ἀλιερκέα Ἰσθμοῦ* mutually support each other; and the possibility that *Ἰσθμός* may have been originally digammated, though not proved, has not been disproved. In any case *αὖτις* (=*πάλιν*, *denuo*) is not right, because it is not to the point. *αὖτε* (=*αὖ*, *vicissim*) is just what is needed. Bergk gives *νῦν αὖ τὶν Ἰσθμοῦ δέσποτα*, of which few will approve.

6. **ὁπλοτάτου**] The first syllable is long here (so *ὁ̄πλότερος* *Pyth.* VI. 41), but in *Isth.* VII. 20 *ὁ̆πλόταται*. Pindar has *ὁ̄πλον* generally, twice *ὁ̆*. Cp. *Isth.* I. 23.—The form *Νηρηΐδων* as well as *Νηρεΐδων* is found in Pindar; he has also *Νηρῆος* (*Ol.* II. 32) as well as *Νηρέος*. For the mention of the Nereids here see above *Introduction* p. 81.

7. **Φυλακίδα**] responds to **Φυλακίδᾳ**

σωτῆρι πορσαίνοντας Ὀλυμπίῳ Αἴγιναν κατὰ
σπένδειν μελιφθόγγοις ἀοιδαῖς.

εἰ γάρ τις ἀνθρώπων δαπάνᾳ τε χαρεὶς ἀντ. α'. 10
καὶ πόνῳ πράσσει θεοδμάτους ἀρετάς,
σύν τέ Ϝοι δαίμων φυτεύει δόξαν ἐπήρατον· ἐσχατιὰς ἤδη πρὸς
ὄλβου

l. 57 (Mezger). Pindar does not say directly that it is for Phylacidas that he prays for an Olympian victory. His actual words only point to some member of the house of Lampon. But Mezger concludes from this responsion, that Phylacidas is meant.

**εἴη**] εἴη πορσαίνοντας σπένδειν, stronger than πορσαίνοντες ἡμεῖς σπένδοιμεν. The impersonal form of the prayer, really meant for Zeus (ὦ Ζεῦ l. 3), is determined by the formal consideration that an address in the second person would be inconsistent with Ὀλυμπίῳ σωτῆρι.—**τρίτον**, understand κρατῆρα, that is ὕμνον.

8. **πορσαίνοντας**] *preparing for presentation*, *offering*, equivalent, as far as we can judge, to πορσύνοντας (which Hartung reads). MSS. often vary between πορσαίνω and πορσύνω, and our data are not sufficiently many or certain to enable us to differentiate the two forms. The MSS. are unanimous in this passage, and in *Ol.* VI. 33 ἐκέλευσεν ἥρωι πορσαίνειν δόμεν Εἰλατίδᾳ βρέφος, where the scholiast explains ἤγουν ἀνατρέφειν, αὔξειν, 'to bring to ripeness'. Comparing these two Pindaric passages, I think we may deduce the meaning 'further to fulfilment', manhood being the fulfilment in *Ol.* VI. 33; while in the passage before us an Olympian is conceived as the final achievement in a series of epinician Odes. But the felicity of πορσαίνοντας lies in the circumstance that, if it was not itself properly used in the sense of πορσύνω, 'provide, prepare', it was associated with that word, and was thus here appropriate to the figure, suggesting the presentation of the wine to Zeus. By rendering 'fulfil' we might keep up the double meaning.

**κατὰ σπένδειν**] That is, κατασπένδειν, preposition and verb being severed for the sake of the metre. κατασπένδω is usually found with accusative of the libation, but also with dative of the libation and accusative of the recipient of the libation, here the soil of Aegina. Cp. Euripides, *Orestes* 1239 δακρύοις κατασπένδω σ' ('over thee' namely Agamemnon underground. See Mr Fennell's note). Others read κάτα.—D has σπεύδειν. **σπένδειν** does not occur elsewhere in Pindar. It is echoed by **σπονδαῖσιν** (also ἅπ. εἰρ. in Pindar) l. 37.—**μελιφθόγγοις**, see above II. 7.

10. **χαρείς**] This tense of χαίρω only here in Pindar. For δαπάνᾳ χαρείς, referring to expenditure on competition in the great games, cp. *Pyth.* I. 90 μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις, *Isth.* I. 42, III. B 29, IV. 57.

11. **πράσσει**] *make, shape*, in a literal material sense. So *Pyth.* II. 40 τὸν δὲ τετράκναμον ἔπραξε δεσμόν. *Nem.* IX. 3 ὕμνον πράσσετε (al. πράσσεται), *Ol.* VIII. 29 ὁ δ' ἐπαντέλλων χρόνος τοῦτο πράσσων μὴ κάμοι. *Isth.* IV. 8 (see note).—In rendering, the metaphor from building should be retained: *If a man, taking pleasure in expense and in labour, builds up divine towers of excellence.* Cp. Homer's θεόδμητοι πύργοι, and *Isth.* IV. 45. Pindar uses θεόδματος of Delos, freedom (*Pyth.* I. 61), chariots, laws. πράσσοντί με θεόδματον χρέος in *Ol.* III. 7 must not mislead us into supposing that πράσσει ἀρετάς here means 'demands the works of a poet's genius'.

12. **σύν τέ Ϝοι**] εἰ is carried on, and **σύν** is adverbial.—**φυτεύει**. There is no change of metaphor. The conception is a

*βάλλετ' ἄγκυραν θεότιμος ἐών.*
*τοίαισιν ὀργαῖς εὔχεται*
*ἀντιάσαις ἀΐδαν γῆράς τε δέξασθαι πολιὸν* 15
*ὁ Κλεονίκου παῖς· ἐγὼ δ' ὑψίθρονον*

plantation or garden of glory, around the palace of manlihood (ἀρετά). We might render, *And if heaven will too that a delightful garden of glory be planted for him.* For φυτεύω used figuratively cp. Sophocles, *Ajax* 953 Παλλὰς φυτεύει πῆμα, *Oed. Rex* 347 καὶ ξυμφυτεῦσαι τοὔργον.—**ἐπήρατον**, *amoenam.* In Pindar only here, and *Pyth.* V. 73, also of fame ἐπήρατον κλέος. The figure of planting honour recurs in *Pyth.* IV. 69 θεόπομποί σφισιν τιμαὶ φύτευθεν, cp. *Nem.* VIII. 16.

**ἐσχατιάς**] B and schol. ἐσχατιαῖς (πρὸς ταῖς ἐσχατιαῖς τοῦ ὄλβου); D ἐσχατιάς (so Boeckh, Bergk). I regard Bergk's ἐσχατιαῖς (Aeol. accus. cp. *Isth.* I. 24, VI. 8) as probable, for it accounts for the two readings of the MSS. In sense the accusative is, I think, superior to the dative. πρὸς ἐσχατιαῖς would mean *hard by the extreme shores he casts anchor*, or *he casts anchor on the extreme shores.* It is to be observed that πρός with the dative is very rare in Pindar, there being only three certain instances *Pyth.* I. 86, IV. 24 (ποτί in composition) and IX. 118. In *frag.* 205 the MSS. have ποτε. Here the accusative seems better: 'reaching the furthest limits of weal, he casts anchor, being held in honour of the gods'. A verb of motion is unnecessary, being implied in βάλλετ' ἄγκυραν. The reference is to the pillars of Heracles, Pindar's 'standing' figure for supreme success. For **ἐσχατιά** in this sense ('the end of the world') cp. *Ol.* III. 43:

> νῦν γε πρὸς ἐσχατιὰν Θήρων ἀρεταῖσιν ἱκάνων ἅπτεται
> οἴκοθεν Ἡρακλέος σταλᾶν.

(ἐσχατιά is also found in *Pyth.* XI. 56.) Cp. also ναυτιλίας ἐσχάτας *Nem.* III. 22; *Isth.* III. B 29; *Pyth.* X. 28.

13. **βάλλετ'**] For βάλλεται.—**θεότιμος**, only found here in early writers.

14. **τοίαισιν ὀργαῖς**] τοῖος, here and *Pyth.* IV. 157 (ἔσομαι τοῖος), refers to **χαρείς**, κ.τ.λ. l. 10. ὀργαῖς, *ambitions.* Generally of temper, mood of mind, but always subjective (not *quae quis appetit*, as Dissen explains). Cp. *Pyth.* II. 77, of the character of foxes, ὀργαῖς ἀλωπέκων ἴκελοι, *Pyth.* IX. 43 μείλιχος ὀργά, *Isth.* II. 35, V. 34. Here ὀργαῖς is defined by τοίαισιν to mean the temper which delights in toil for the sake of distinction and fame.

**εὔχεται** κ.τ.λ.] *The son of Cleonicus prays that having encountered such feelings he may receive death and gray eld;* that is, 'that he may not grow old and die until his highest ambition has been won'. ἀντιάζω (Homeric ἀντιάω) with the dative means to encounter, as friend or foe; in *Nem.* I. 68, the hostile meaning is determined by μάχαν (Γιγάντεσσιν μάχαν ἀντιάζωσιν). So too the context determines the meaning in Soph. *Oedipus Rex* 191, φλέγει με περιβόατος ἀντιάζων 'amid cries as of battle wraps me in the flame of his onset' (Jebb). Dissen's *compos factus* and Mr Fennell's 'attain' would be suitable equivalents for ἀντιάσαις, if it were constructed with the genitive; but with the dative it seems to signify a chance meeting. It is an example of Greek irony that Lampon's realisation of his dearest wishes is described as an accidental encounter. The ὀργαί are, in some measure, personified.—Mezger's interpretation 'he boasts that having realised such a lot he awaits death' is inconsistent with the context and would require δέχεσθαι.

16. **ὑψίθρονον**] The second syllable is long here but short *Nem.* IV. 65 where it is an epithet of the Nereids. In both places it suggests a work of sculpture.

Κλωθὼ κασιγνήτας τε προσεννέπω ἑσπέσθαι κλυταῖς
ἀνδρὸς φίλου Μοίρας ἐφετμαῖς·

ὔμμε τ', ὦ χρυσάρματοι Αἰακίδαι, ἐπ. α'.
τέθμιόν μοι φαμὶ σαφέστατον ἔμμεν 20
τάνδ' ἐπιστείχοντα νᾶσον ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίαις.
μυρίαι δ' ἔργων καλῶν τέτμηνθ' ἑκατόμπεδοι ἐν σχερῷ κέλευθοι
καὶ πέραν Νείλοιο παγᾶν καὶ δι' Ὑπερβορέους·
οὔτ' ἔστιν οὕτω βάρβαρος οὔτε παλίγγλωσσος πόλις,

17. **Κλωθὼ** κ.τ.λ.] Clotho is also specially mentioned in *Ol.* I. 26.—**προσεννέπω**, a neutral word equivalent neither to *precor* nor *jubeo*, but suggesting both; just as ἑσπέσθαι is more than *indulgere* and less than *obedire*, ἐφετμαῖς less than mandates but more than entreaties. *My word to Clotho high enthroned and her sister Moirai is to follow the noble wishes of the man, my friend.*—With this 'pregnant' sense of προσεννέπω compare φαμί 'I bid' *Nem.* III. 28 and Aesch. *Agam.* 514 τούς τ' ἀγωνίους θεοὺς πάντας προσαυδῶ—δέχεσθαι. Spenser uses 'areed' in a like way. **ἑσπέσθαι** is Mr Fennell's modification of Pauw's ἕσπεσθαι, for the MSS. σπέσθαι. Such a correction is required by the metre; and I cannot see how 'πισπέσθαι, which Mr Fennell conjectures in his note, would be metrically possible.—For ἐφετμαῖς Mr Fennell quotes A 495 Θέτις δ' οὐ λήθετ' ἐφετμαῖς παιδὸς ἑοῦ.

19. **ὔμμε τ'** κ.τ.λ.] τ' is not equivalent to δέ, but joins προσσεννέπω with φαμί. I have therefore removed the strong stop which editors always print after ἐφετμαῖς, and substituted the mark of a half pause.—The construction is: φαμὶ τέθμιόν μοι σαφέστατον εἶναι, (ἐμὲ) τάνδ' ἐπιστειχοντα νᾶσον, ὔμμε ῥαινέμεν εὐλογίαις. The epithet χρυσάρματος (found in no author earlier than Pindar) is applied to the moon in *Ol.* III. 19, to Castor in *Pyth.* V. 9, to Thebes in *frag.* 323.

20. **τέθμιον σαφέστατον**] *a writ most clear.* τἔθμιον here, but in *Nem.* XI. 27 τἔθμιον; τἔθμός always.

21. **ἐπιστείχοντα**] *when I visit*, only here in Pindar. In Aeschylus *Eumen.* 906 it is used with ἀήματα, in Euripides *Phoen.* 9 with ἡμέραν.—**ῥαίνω** is found in its literal sense in *Isth.* VII. 55; metaphorically, as here, of hymns in *Pyth.* VIII. 57 ὕμνῳ, V. 100 δρόσῳ μαλθακᾷ ὕμνων. See below l. 64. For **εὐλογίαις** cp. *Isth.* III. A 3.

22. **μυρίαι** κ.τ.λ.] *For of fair deeds countless are the highroads which have been cut, measuring a hundred feet perpetual, beyond the springs of the Nile, through the borders of the Hyperboreans.* Compare μυρία κέλευθος *Isth.* III. B 1, and note there.—**τέτμηνθ'** for τέτμηνται, like βάλλετ' l. 13 above.—**ἑκατόμπεδοι**, 100 feet wide. In Ψ 164 we have πυρὴ ἑκατόμπεδος ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα. Boeckh notices that τριακοντάπεδος ὁδός occurs in the *Tabulae Heracleenses.*

23. **δι' Ὑπερβορέους**] The preposition does not mean *beyond*, for the Hyperboreans were the most northerly people known to myth, but *throughout.* **πέραν Νείλοιο παγᾶν** is equivalent to δι' Αἰθίοπας. διά means *per*, never *ultra.*

24. **οὔτ' ἔστιν** κ.τ.λ.] An emphatic asyndeton. Editors weaken this verse by substituting (from the scholia) οὐδ' for οὔτ'. *There is not a city either so barbarous or so recreant in tongue, that knows not of the fame of the hero Peleus, who wedded a daughter of the gods, or yet the fame of Ajax, Telamon's son, and of his sire.*—**βάρβαρος** (only here in Pindar)

ἅτις οὐ Πηλέος ἀΐει κλέος ἥρωος, εὐδαίμονος γαμβροῦ θεῶν, 25

οὐδ' ἅτις Αἴαντος Τελαμωνιάδα στρ. β'.
καὶ πατρός· τὸν χαλκοχάρμαν ἐς πόλεμον
ἄγε σὺν Τιρυνθίοισι πρόφρονα σύμμαχον ἐς Τροΐαν, ἥρωσι μόχθον,
Λαομεδοντειᾶν ὑπὲρ ἀμπλακιᾶν
ἐν ναυσὶν Ἀλκμήνας τέκος. 30
εἷλε δὲ Περγαμίαν, πέφνεν δὲ σὺν κείνῳ Μερόπων τ'

refers to non-Hellenic speech, **παλίγγλωσσος** (for which see note on *Nem.* I. 58) to local Hellenic dialects.

25. **ἀΐει**] MSS. αὔει. I have adopted Hermann's emendation which has been generally accepted, and is supported by the schol. κατακούει. Yet one hardly sees why ἀΐει should have been so corrupted. In Anacreon, *fr.* 4 the MSS. have δίζημαί σε, σὺ δ' οὐκ ἀΐεις, and Bergk proposes οὐ κοεῖς. This suggests οὐ κοέει here. But I am not sure that the reading of the MSS. is indefensible. αὔσω and ἤυσα presuppose a present ἀϝύω, which would become αὔω, the form which we actually find in Homer (in other cases we find the original and the contracted forms side by side; for instance πάϝις and παῖς). The form is not the difficulty, but the construction; and if there were an exact parallel in Homer to αὔει κλέος 'ring with the fame', I should venture to preserve it.

26. **ἅτις**] understand ἀΐει κλέος.

27. **καὶ πατρός· τὸν** κ.τ.λ.] *and of his sire* (Telamon); *him the son of Alcmena led on a sea voyage to war which fighteth with brass, along with Tirynthian men a zealous ally, even unto Troy* (*that weary quest for heroes*) *to punish the wrongdoings of Laomedon.*—**τόν**, relative, but with demonstrative force. **χαλκοχάρμᾱς** (also in *Pyth.* V. 82 of the Trojans) is formed like the Homeric ἱππιοχάρμης (and Pindar's ἱπποχάρμας) from χάρμᾱ *battle.* So too σιδαροχάρμᾱς (of steeds) in *Pyth.* II. 2, and ἀκαμαντόχαρμαν Αἴαν *frag.* 184, with which compare ἀκαματομάχας. In view of these words it seems to me that Rumpel is wrong in translating *aere laetus*. Although Pindar shared the misapprehension of popular etymology that χάρμᾱ was closely connected with χάρμᾰ, χαίρω &c., the notion of joy was still merely a suggested notion and not the proper meaning; as is obvious in μενεχάρμης, ἱππιοχάρμης and in most of the Homeric passages where χάρμη occurs.—Schol. εἰς ἰσχυρότατον πόλεμον.

28. **Τιρυνθίοισι**] At this time Heracles dwelled in Tiryns.—**μόχθον** in apposition with Τρωΐαν. Compare Κακοΐλιος οὐκ ὀνομαστή, and see also *Isth.* VII. 11 ἀτόλματον Ἑλλάδι μόχθον (of the Persian war). The scholiast takes μόχθον with σύμμαχον and refers ἥρωσι to the Trojan warriors.—In the next line the MSS. have Λαομεδοντίαν ὑπὲρ ἀμπλακίαν. The schol. has τῶν τοῦ Λαομέδοντος ἁμαρτιῶν χάριν, whence Kayser restored the reading in the text.

31. **εἷλε** κ.τ.λ.] *With him* (Telamon) *he* (Heracles) *conquered the land of Pergamos, and slew both tribes of Meropes and the oxherd Alcyoneus whom he found at Phlegrae.*—MSS. Μερόπων τ', but the scholiasts, as Mommsen pointed out, seem to have been unacquainted with the τ'. Boeckh and editors after him omit it, and likewise δ' in l. 35. To me this double change seems arbitrary; the text of the MSS. leaves nothing to be desired. The expedition against the Meropes of Cos is referred to by Homer, Ξ 255 and O 28,

καί μιν ἔπειτα Κόωνδ' εὖ ναιομένην ἀπένεικας.

Compare also *Nem.* IV. 26, where the

*ἔθνεα καὶ τὸν βουβόταν οὔρει Ϝίσον*
*Φλέγραισιν εὑρὼν Ἀλκυονῆ, σφετέρας δ' οὐ φείσατο*
*χερσὶν βαρυφθόγγοιο νευρᾶς*

*Ἡρακλέης. ἀλλ' Αἰακίδαν καλέων* *ἀντ. β'.* 35
*ἐς πλόον τετμὼν κύρησεν δαινύμενον.*

same three exploits of Heracles (at Troy, Cos, and Phlegra) are mentioned together in the same order.—πέφνεν- here as usually; πεφν- thrice (*Ol.* II. 46, X. 27, XIII. 90).

32. **τὸν βουβόταν**] The giant Alcyoneus was a 'cattle-lifter'. He drove the kine of the Sun from Erythea. The story is told as follows by Apollodorus (*Bibliotheca* I. 6, 1):

*διέφερε δὲ πάντων Πορφυρίων τε καὶ Ἀλκυονεὺς ὃς δὴ καὶ ἀθάνατος ἦν ἐν ᾗπερ ἐγεννήθη γῇ μαχόμενος. οὗτος δὲ καὶ τὰς Ἡλίου βόας ἐξ Ἐρυθείας ἤλασε. τοῖς δὲ θεοῖς λόγιον ἦν ὑπὸ θεῶν μὲν μηδένα τῶν Γιγάντων ἀπολέσθαι δύνασθαι, συμμαχοῦντος δὲ θνητοῦ τινὸς τελευτήσειν. αἰσθομένη δὲ Γῆ τοῦτο ἐζήτει φάρμακον ἵνα μηδ' ὑπὸ θνητοῦ δυνηθῶσιν ἀπολέσθαι. Ζεὺς δὲ ἀπειπὼν φαίνειν Ἠοῖ τε καὶ Σελήνῃ καὶ Ἡλίῳ τὸ μὲν φάρμακον αὐτὸς ἔταμε φθάσας, Ἡρακλέα δὲ σύμμαχον δι' Ἀθηνᾶς ἐπεκαλέσατο. κἀκεῖνος πρῶτον μὲν ἐτόξευσεν Ἀλκυονέα· ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς μᾶλλον ἀνεθάλπετο· Ἀθηνᾶς δὲ ὑποθεμένης ἔξω τῆς Παλλήνης εἵλκυσεν αὐτόν. κἀκεῖνος μὲν οὕτως ἐτελεύτα.*—In the pictures of this adventure of Heracles on vases, the giant is sometimes represented as asleep. On one black figured oinochoe (see Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, p. 49) he is reclining against a tree, and seems to have just awaked; an enigmatic winged figure is descending, from the overhanging branches, upon his right arm; and Heracles in the lion skin advances upon him with drawn sword. Jahn interprets the winged figure as Sleep.

With *οὔρει Ϝίσον* 'as huge as a mountain', compare κ 113 of the wife of the Laestrygonian king

*τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα*
*εὗρον ὅσην τ' ὄρεος κορυφήν.*

33. **σφετέρας δ'** κ.τ.λ.] *But for his part Heracles spared not to handle his deeply-clanging bowstring.*—Editors omit **δ'**, but see note above, l. 31. Pindar uses *σφέτερος* in three senses: (1) *their own*, *Isth.* II. 27, (2) *his* or *her own*, as here; cp. *Isth.* VII. 61, (3) *their*, *Pyth.* X. 38. Here **σφετέρας** is emphatic.

34. **βαρυφθόγγοιο**] This adjective is found in the Hom. Hymn to Aphrodite, l. 160; in Pindar only here. Compare the ἅπαξ εἰρημένον, βαρυφθεγκτᾶν (λεόντων) in *frag.* 239.

35. **Ἡρᾰκλέης**] ᾰ twelve times, ᾰ ten times, ᾱ once in Pindar.—**καλέων**. Of an errand the present participle seems quite correct. It is mentioned in the scholia that the following scene is taken from 'the Great Eoiai,' *ἐκ τῶν μεγάλων Ἠοιῶν: ἐκεῖ γὰρ εὑρίσκεται ἐπιξενούμενος ὁ Ἡρακλῆς τῷ Τελαμῶνι καὶ ἐμβαίνων τῇ δορᾷ καὶ εὐχόμενος, καὶ οὗτος ὁ διόπομπος αἰετὸς, ἀφ' οὗ τὴν προσωνυμίαν ἔλαβεν Αἴας.*

36. **ἐς πλόον** κ.τ.λ.] B has *ἐς πλόον, κήρυσσε δαινυμένων*, D *ἐς πλόον κύρησε δαινυμένων*. Triclinius supplied the metrical deficiency by *πάντων* after *κύρησε*, but, as the metre requires a long syllable after *πλόον*, Heyne and Hermann, adopting the Triclinian *πάντων*, read respectively *κάρυξε* and *κάρυσσε*. Pauw proposed *κήρυξεν ἀστῶν*. But the verb *καρύσσω* (never, it may be observed, found in Pindar) is not to the purpose here. In the scholia we read (Abel p. 451) *ἀλλὰ τὸν Αἰακοῦ παῖδα τὸν Τελαμῶνα εἰς τοῦτον τὸν πλοῦν καὶ ταύτην τὴν συμμαχίαν καλῶν ἔτυχεν ἀνευρὼν εὐωχούμενον τὸν Τελαμῶνα.* Hence Mommsen inferred that *τοῦτον* was in the

*τὸν μὲν ἐν ῥινῷ λέοντος στάντα κελήσατο νεκταρέαις σπονδαῖσιν ἄρξαι*
*καρτεραίχμαν* Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδαν,
*ἄνδωκε δ' αὐτῷ φέρτατος*
*οἰνοδόκον φιάλαν χρυσῷ πεφρικυῖαν* Τελαμών, 40
*ὁ δ' ἀνατείναις οὐρανῷ χεῖρας ἀμάχους*
*αὔδασε τοιοῦτον* Ϝέπος· Εἴ *ποτ' ἐμᾶν, ὦ* Ζεῦ *πάτερ,*

text and reads *ἐς πλόον τοῦτον κύρησεν δαινυμένων*. Christ reads *ἐς πλόον ξυνὸν κύρησεν δαινύμενον*. *δαινύμενον* is suggested by the scholium. And Mr Tyrrell, thinking that *ἔτυχεν ἀνευρών* points to something stronger than *κύρησεν*, proposed **τετμὼν κύρησεν δαινύμενον**, which I have adopted as highly probable. If the omission of *τετμών* could be accounted for on palaeographical principles, I should regard it as certain. I had myself thought of *φωτῶν ἔκυρσεν δαινυμένων*, compare the first line of the Ode, *θάλλοντος* **ἀνδρῶν** *συμποσίου*.

37. **τὸν μέν**] Telamon is the subject of *κελήσατο* and *τόν* is Heracles. **ἐν**, *clad in;* compare *ἐν πολεμαδόκοις* Ἄρεος *ὅπλοις* *Pyth.* X. 13; *Nem.* X. 14. **κελήσατο**: Pindar has also *κέλεται κέλοντο*, and *κέκλευ* (below l. 53).—**ἄρξαι**, *auspicari.* Liddell and Scott are wrong in saying that *σπονδαῖσιν ἄρξαι* here is equivalent to Thucydides, *ἄρχειν τῶν σπονδῶν* (v. 19), which means to 'pour the first libation'. *σπονδαῖσιν* is instrumental, 'to begin by a libation', that is to make a libation before sitting down to the feast; just as *δεπάεσσιν* is instrumental in the Homeric phrase *ἐπάρξασθαι δεπάεσσιν*. **νεκταρέαις**; this adjective is also found in *frag.* 75 *φυτὰ νεκτάρεα*. In Homer it is applied only to raiment.

38. **καρτεραίχμαν**] *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον*. Observe that names of Heracles are placed three times in emphatic position at the end of clauses; (1) Ἀλκμήνας *τέκος* l. 30, (2) Ἡρακλέης l. 35, (3) Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδαν here.

39. **ἄνδωκε**] The preposition has its literal force 'upward' and expresses the passage of the *phiala* from the seated host to his guest who was still standing. So Dissen, *obtulit sublatum*. The verb occurs in one other Pindaric passage, *frag.* 133, where Persephone sends souls up to the sunlight (*ἀνδιδοῖ πάλιν*).

40. **οἰνοδόκον**] This word seems to have been coined by Pindar on the analogy of *ἰοδόκος*. It is not found elsewhere except in the Anthology.—**χρυσῷ πεφρικυῖαν**, in simple language 'of embossed gold'. In the scholia we find the explanation of Aristarchus: Ἀρίσταρχος *ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν κάπρων φησὶν εἰρῆσθαι· φρίξας εὖ λοφιήν* [Τ 446]· *ὡς ἐξοχὰς ἐχούσης τῆς φιάλης καὶ τετραχυμένης τῇ ποικιλίᾳ τοῦ χρυσοῦ καθαπερανεὶ πεφρικότα κάπρον*. Others explained 'bright': *ἔνιοι δὲ τὴν λαμπρὰν ἤκουσαν*. We may compare the Latin expressions *squalens auro, inaequalis.* Mezger thinks that *πεφρικυῖαν* means *hard.*—The first syllable of *πεφρικυῖαν* is short here, but in *Pyth.* IV. 183 we find *πεφρίκοντας*.

41. **ὁ δ'**] refers to *αὐτῷ*, Heracles. **ἀνατείναις** (Boeckh; MSS. *ἀντείνας*), cp. *Ol.* VII. 64 *χεῖρας ἀντεῖναι*. Commentators call **οὐρανῷ** a *dativus termini;* which means that it corresponds in sense to our *towards*. **χεῖρας ἀμάχους** is an echo of the Homeric *χεῖρας ἀάπτους*.

42. **Ϝέπος**] MSS. *τι ἔπος*, Triclinius *τ' ἔπος*. Heyne saw that the mistake was due to the omission of the original digamma.—*τοιοῦτος* in Pindar, as elsewhere, generally points backward; only here and in *Ol.* VI. 16 (where there is the same error in the MSS.) forward.

*θυμῷ θέλων ἀρᾶν ἄκουσας,*

*νῦν σε νῦν εὐχαῖς ὑπὸ θεσπεσίαις* ἐπ. β΄.
*λίσσομαι παῖδα θρασὺν ἐξ Ἐριβοίας* 45
*ἀνδρὶ τῷδε ξυνόδαμον μοιρίδιον τελέσαι·*

**ἐμᾶν...ἀρᾶν.** A certain restoration of Mommsen and Bergk for MSS. *ἐμὰν... ἀράν*. The scholiast paraphrases thus: *ὦ πάτερ Ζεῦ, εἴποτε τῶν ἐμῶν εὐχῶν ἑκὼν καὶ μετὰ προθυμίας κατήκουσας κ.τ.λ.*

43. **θέλων**] regularly used of the propitious humour of a deity, *If thou didst ever incline a favourable ear to my prayers, now yield to the potency of earnest vows, now hear my supplication, that etc.*—D has *θυμόν*.

44. **ὑπό**] The force of the preposition is the same as in *δαμεῖσα χρυσέοις τόξοισιν ὑπ' Ἀρτέμιδος Pyth.* III. 10, or *βελέων ὑπὸ ῥιπαῖσι Nem.* I. 68. Zeus must yield to the assault of his son's powerful prayers. The expression is softened by the substitution of *σε λίσσομαι* for a verb of yielding or hearkening with Zeus as subject.—**θεσπεσίαις** is the correction of Ceporinus for MSS. *θεσπεσίαν*. Schol. *θείαις εὐχαῖς*. Cp. *Isth.* III. B 39.

46. **ἀνδρὶ κ.τ.λ.**] B has *ἀνδρὶ τοῖδε ξεῖνον ἀμόν*, D *ἀνδρὶ τόνδε κεῖνον ἀμόν*. From the reading of B, with the slight alteration of *τῷδε* for *τοῖδε* (so Triclinius), sense has been elicited in various ways. (1) The scholiast construes *τελέσαι* twice: (*a*) with *παῖδα* and (*b*) with *ξεῖνον*. His note is *τὸ τελέσαι κατὰ κοινοῦ· τελέσαι τῷδε παῖδα καὶ λίσσομαί σε τὸν ἐμὸν φίλον Τελαμῶνα εὐτυχῆ τελέσαι.* This however may be regarded as impossible without a copula (*ξεῖνόν τ'* or *καὶ ξεῖνον*). (2) *λίσσομαι* is sometimes found in Homer with an accusative of the thing requested as well as of the person. Thus *σε λίσσομαι παῖδα* might mean 'I ask thee for a son', and in that case *τελέσαι* might be the infinitive of consequence, 'so as to work the happiness of my friend' (*hospitem meum qui plane felicem reddat*, Dissen). This explanation was adopted by Hermann, Boeckh and Dissen. The decisive objection is that (like 1) it ascribes an impossible sense to *μοιρίδιον*, which means *destined, marked out by Moira* (cp. Eur. *Bacch.* 99), and could not mean happy.

Various corrections have been suggested, of which may be mentioned, (1) Schnitzer's *ἀνδρὶ τῷδε ξείνιόν μου* ('as a guest-gift from me', in apposition with *παῖδα*), accepted by Christ and Mezger; (2) Bergk's *ἄνδρα τόνδε ξεῖνον ἀμόν* ('that this man, my friend, may beget a son, in accordance with fate', *τελέσαι=ἐκποιεῖσθαι*). (3) Mr Fennell reads *ἀνδρὶ τῷδε, Ξείνι', ἆμαρ μοιρίδιον τελέσαι*, where *Ξείνιε* takes up *Ζεῦ πάτερ*, and *ἆμαρ μοιρίδιον* is explained 'on the destined day' with a reference to *Isth.* III. B 67. But in that passage *δεύτερον ἆμαρ* has the regular force of the accusative (see note); *ἆμαρ =ἄματι* seems impossible. Mr Fennell however might preserve his reading and avoid this objection by rendering, 'I beseech thee, O Zeus of guestplight, that a destined day may bring to fulness for this man a brave son by Eriboea'.

In considering this passage the following points should be observed. (1) It seems almost certain that the construction is *λίσσομαί σε τελέσαι*, 'I pray thee to bring to fulfilment', *τελεῖν* being the verb suitable to *Ζεὺς τέλειος* (so Fennell). (2) The word after *τῷδε* began with a double consonant, as the second foot of the verse must be a spondee; and the reading of B *ξεῖνον* makes it certain that *ξ* was the first letter. (3) But *ξεῖνον* itself can hardly be right, for it does not explain the reading of D, *κεῖνον*. And it must be remembered that in a passage like this, where the story turns on the guestfriend-

*τὰν μὲν ἄρρηκτον φυάν, ὥσπερ τόδε δέρμα με νῦν περιπλανᾶται*
*θηρός, ὃν πάμπρωτον ἀέθλων κτεῖνά ποτ' ἐν Νεμέᾳ·*
*θυμὸς δ' ἑπέσθω. ταῦτ' ἄρα ϝοι φαμένῳ πέμψεν θεὸς*
*ἀρχὸν οἰωνῶν μέγαν αἰετόν· ἁδεῖα δ' ἔνδον νιν ἔκνιξεν χάρις,* 50

ship between Telamon and Heracles, *ξεῖνον* was a most likely word to intrude itself. (4) If we place *ξεῖνον* and *κεῖνον* side by side, we easily see that they may point back to *ξυνόν* : *κοινόν*. Hence we get *ξυνὸν ἀμὸν* which explains the readings of B and D. (5) *ξυνὸν ἀμὸν* was a corruption of **ξυνόδαμον**, a brilliant suggestion of Bergk, though he hardly apprehended its force. This compound puzzled a copyist and led to a corruption, which in turn led to further corruptions. A passage in *Ol.* IX. (quoted by Bergk) illustrates *ξυνόδαμος*. We read there of Deucalion and Pyrrha

> *ἄτερ δ' εὐνᾶς ὁμόδαμον*
> *κτισσάσθαν λίθινον γόνον·*
> *λαοὶ δ' ὀνόμασθεν,*

where *ὁμόδαμος* means *congener* (cp. *Isth.* I. 30). **ξυνόδαμον**, *belonging to the same damos* as Telamon, means that Ajax will be legitimate (cp. the emphatic *ἐξ Ἐριβοίας*), and thereby a *δαμότας* (not like Teucer).

With **ἀνδρὶ—μοιρίδιον** compare l. 18 **ἀνδρὸς—Μοίρας**, and see *Introduction*.

47. **τὰν μέν**] That is *τὰν μὲν φυὰν ἄρρηκτον*, *in bodily strength stalwart*, **ἄρρηκτον** is simply in apposition with *παῖδα*. The reading of the MSS. **τὸν μέν** (corrected by Mezger; Rauchenstein *τὸν θές*) is hardly possible. For the contrast is not between Ajax and someone else, but between his *φυά* and his *θυμός*; and *τὸν μὲν ἄρρηκτον φυὰν* for *φυὰν μὲν ἄρρηκτον τὸν* (or *τοῦτον*) is very curious. **τὰν** separated thus from *φυάν* is Homeric and was exposed to corruption. **ἄρρηκτος** is Homeric, but is only found here in Pindar. It is worth noticing, in illustration of the context, that Herodotus uses it of the skin of a crocodile (II. 68).

**ὥσπερ τόδε** *κ.τ.λ.*] 'Stalwart as the beast whose skin now strays loosely round my limbs'. The Greek idiom of divorcing the logical and the grammatical predicates of a sentence, in order to avoid a relative clause, is familiar. The verb, instead of expressing the true predicate, expresses an attribute of the subject. In the present instance the meaning is: *ὥσπερ θήρ* (*ἐστιν ἄρρηκτος*) *οὗ τόδε δέρμα με νῦν περιπλανᾶται*. At **τόδε** Heracles may be supposed to touch his skin.—**περιπλανᾶται** suggests the loose fall and unstudied shape of the natural garment. It may have been chosen partly as suited to the skin of a roving beast.—*με νῦν* is the correction of Stephanus, MSS. *μίμνοι*.

48. **πάμπρωτον**] The grammar is *πάμπρωτον ἄεθλον ἀέθλων*, in apposition with *ὅν*. The lion was an *ἄεθλος* (as Troy is called a *μόχθος*, above, l. 28).

49. **θυμός**] Understand *θηρός* (Mezger). 'Let the spirit of the lion inform the lion-like body'; lit. *accompany the φυά*.

49. **φαμένῳ**] We find the middle of *φαμί* with an accusative here and *Nem.* IX. 43, with infinitive *Pyth.* IV. 33, with adverbs *Pyth.* III. 43, IV. 120, cp. *Isth.* VII. 48.

50. **ἀρχόν**] *lord of birds.* This phrase occurs also in *Pyth.* I. 7. Pindar has *ἀρχός* of the sun, as lord of his horses, *Ol.* VII. 71; of Jason *Pyth.* IV. 194; of Hiero, 'the Syracusan lord', *Pyth.* I. 73; of the lordship of the Adrastids, *Nem.* IX. 14.—**ἔνδον νιν ἔκνιξεν**, *thrilled his soul* (*eum intus titillavit*). *κνίζω* is a favourite word with Pindar, to express an irritation of the emotions, whether pleasant or unpleasant. Of the stimulus of all kinds of desires, *Pyth.* X. 60 *ἑτέροις ἑτερωνίων ἔκνιξ' ἔρως φρένας*. Of disagreeable sensations, cp. *Nem.* V. 32, *Pyth.* VIII. 32, XI. 23. In *Ol.* VI. 44

εἶπέν τε φωνήσαις ἅτε μάντις ἀνήρ· στρ. γ'.
Ἔσσεταί τοι παῖς ὃν αἰτεῖς, ὦ Τελαμών·
καί νιν ὄρνιχος φανέντος κέκλευ ἐπώνυμον εὐρυβίαν Αἴαντα, λαῶν
ἐν πόνοις ἔκπαγλον Ἐνυαλίου.
ὣς ἄρα ϝειπὼν αὐτίκα 55
ἕζετ'. ἐμοὶ δὲ μακρὸν πάσας ἀναγήσασθ' ἀρετάς·

κνιζομένα is used of the throes of labour, 'stung by pain'. See also note on *Isth.* IV. 58. In the present passage ἔκνιξεν suggests that the portent moved Heracles to utter the prophetic words which follow. It is to be observed that in Pindar initial κν always lengthens a preceding short vowel. For κν in the middle of a word see note on *Isth.* I. 17.—For the subjective sense of χάρις, *joy*, compare *Pyth.* VIII. 86 ὦρσεν χάριν 'made mothers glad'.

51. **μάντις ἀνήρ**] So μάντιες ἄνδρες *Ol.* VIII. 2. μάντις, originally adjectival, as these phrases indicate, ousted from use the substantive μαντεύς which is presupposed by μαντεύω, and of which the genitive μάντηος is preserved in the Odyssey.

52. **αἰτεῖς**] Pindar has both αἰτέω and αἴτημι.

53. **κέκλευ**] MSS. κέκλετ'. The correction is due to Philip Melanchthon, though perhaps we should adopt the form κέκλε' (as Bergk suggests). Compare Hesychius κέκλεο· κάλεσον. The imperative is wanted, and it would be very daring to assume that κέκλετε existed as an active imperative, as there is no trace of active forms of κέλομαι. κέκλετο, as far as I can see, is impossible without an expressed subject. The scholiast supplied τὸ θεῖον, Mr Fennell supplies Zeus and describes κέκλετο as 'idiomatic aorist'. This seems hardly possible. Hartung inserted θεός after Ἐνυαλίου, on the assumption that the scholiast must have had θεός in his text. It seems to me that Melanchthon's emendation is not only brilliant but almost certain. The corruption of the uncommon imperative to the more usual indicative, at the expense of the sense, was very natural.

We shall perhaps do best to regard **ὄρνιχος φανέντος** as genitive absolute, mentally supplying ὄρνιχος with ἐπώνυμον. The order of the words indicates this. 'And him, as the bird has appeared, call in memory of its name Aias, of large might':—Αἴας after αἰετός.—Pindar has both ἐπώνυμος and ἐπωνύμιος. εὐρυβίας is applied to Poseidon in *Ol.* VI. 58 and *Pyth.* II. 12; to Periclymenus *Pyth.* IV. 175, to Hypseus *Pyth.* IX. 13. Hesiod has the word in *Theogony* 931 (Τρίτων εὐρυβίης, so εὐρυσθενής of Poseidon).

**λαῶν κ.τ.λ.**] λαῶν has been taken (1) as depending on ἐν πόνοις Ἐνυαλίου, *in hominum laboribus bellicis*, Dissen, (2) as determined by ἔκπαγλον, 'hervorragend vor den Völkern' Mezger; so schol. γενναῖον ὄντα ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς πόνοις καὶ καμάτοις τοῦ πολέμου καὶ ἔξαρχον τῶν ἄλλων ὄχλων. The latter interpretation is certainly right. Ajax is to be distinguished among men, as the eagle among birds (ἀρχὸν οἰωνῶν).—We find ἔκπαγλος of bodily strength in *Isth.* VI. 22; cp. *Nem.* IV. 27 (of the giant Alcyoneus).

55. **αὐτίκα**] The hiatus at the end of this verse is remarkable. Possibly it was felt as less harsh before an aspirated than it would be before an unaspirated word.

56. **ἐμοὶ κ.τ.λ.**] *It were long for me to rehearse all their excellences; for I came, O Muse, as a dispenser of hymns unto Phylacidas, Pytheas and Euthymenes.*

Φυλακίδᾳ γὰρ ἦλθον, ὦ Μοῖσα, ταμίας
Πυθέᾳ τε κώμων Εὐθυμένει τε. τὸν Ἀργείων τρόπον
εἰρήσεται βαί' ἐν βραχίστοις.

ἄραντο γὰρ νίκας ἀπὸ παγκρατίου ἀντ. γ΄. 60
τρεῖς, ἀπ' Ἰσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας,

*In the fashion of Argive men, it shall be a brief argument.* The MSS. have ἀγήσασθ' ἀρετᾶς. Mingarelli restored **ἀναγήσασθ'**. The genitive was a consequence of the accidental omission of the ἀν-. The scholia rightly explain ἀρετάς of the Aeacids: τὰς τῶν Αἰακιδῶν ἀρετάς. Others refer it to Ajax in particular; but Pindar is coming back here to where he started in l. 19 *sqq.* Ajax is only one instance of Aeacid excellence.

57. **ταμίας**] For metaphorical uses of this word cp. *Nem.* VI. 30, *frag.* 1, l. 7. The poet is supposed to have a store of hymns, from which he dispenses like a treasurer or steward. Cp. Bergk *P. L. G.* III. p. 718, *frag. adesp.* 87 ἔστι μοι πιστὸν ταμιεῖον ἐπὶ γλώσσας.—Schmid read γάρ τ' *metri gratia*, and so Boehmer.

58. **Ἀργείων**] The Argives, as well as the Laconians, were noted for a brevity of speech which became proverbial. The scholiast quotes a couplet from the 'Mad Odysseus' of Sophocles:

πάντ' οἶσθα πάντ' ἔλεξα τἀντεταλμένα·
μῦθος γὰρ Ἀργολιστὶ συντέμνειν βραχύς.

Aeschylus refers to this characteristic in the 'Suppliant Women', 196

μακρὰν γε μὲν δὴ ῥῆσιν οὐ στέργει πόλις.

Dissen supposes that, when Pindar wrote the words in question, he remembered the tradition that *Argive* Dorians settled in Aegina.—The scholiast seems to have punctuated after τρόπον; thus connecting the last three words of the verse with ταμίας.

59. **εἰρήσεται κ.τ.λ.**] D has πα κ' ἐν βραχίστοις, B που κὲν βραχίστοις. Many editors accept the reading of D, with πᾳ for πα, and explain the construction by the Homeric use of the future with κε. But when κε is used with the future in Homer, it has a particular force; whereas here it is quite out of place, a plain future being required. Mommsen read πᾳ δ', Dissen πως, and other suggestions have been made; but Bergk has the credit of having seen that the subject of εἰρήσεται should be a word meaning 'a few matters'. He therefore read παῦρ' ἐν βραχίστοις, rightly in point of sense. Pindar says that he can only select a few of the excellences of Lampon's family and dwell even on these very briefly. But the corruption of παῦρ' cannot be easily explained. There is a somewhat similar passage in *Pyth.* IX. 76 *sqq.* where we read

ἀρεταὶ δ' αἰεὶ μεγάλαι πολύμυθοι·
βαιὰ δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν
ἀκοὰ σοφοῖς.

What Pindar is doing in this Isthmian Ode is exactly described by the words βαιὰ ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν. With a large material at his disposal, he handles a small selection artistically. This suggests **βαί' ἐν βραχίστοις**. With this reading the corruption can be accounted for without difficulty. βαι might easily have puzzled a reader, and καί, connecting τὸν Ἀργείων τρόπον with ἐν βραχίστοις, was an obvious correction. καί as an adscript or interlinear correction was sure to intrude itself into the text, either in place of βαι or beside it. Given ΕΙΡΗϹΕΤΑΙ ΒΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΒΡΑΧΙϹΤΟΙϹ, ΠΑΙ for ΒΑΙ was a ready substitute. The readings of the MSS. naturally follow.

61. **τρεῖς, ἀπ' Ἰσθμοῦ κ.τ.λ.**] The punctuation after τρεῖς is due to Bergk. Three victories had been gained in all at the greater festival by Phylacidas, Pytheas

ἀγλαοὶ παῖδές τε καὶ μάτρως· ἀνὰ δ' ἄγαγον ἐς φάος οἵαν
μοῖραν ὕμνων,
τὰν Ψαλυχιαδᾶν δὲ πάτραν Χαρίτων
ἄρδοντι καλλίστᾳ δρόσῳ,
τόν τε Θεμιστίου ὀρθώσαντες οἶκον τάνδε πόλιν 65
θεοφιλῆ ναίοισι. Λάμπων δὲ μελέταν
ἔργοις ὀπάζων Ἡσιόδου μάλα τιμᾷ τοῦτ' ἔπος,
υἱοῖσί τε φράζων παραινεῖ,

and Euthymenes: (1) an Isthmian by Phylacidas, celebrated in this hymn, (2) a Nemean by Pytheas, celebrated in *Nemean V.* and referred to above in l. 3, (3) a Nemean by Euthymenes, referred to in *Nemean V.* We may render: *For the splendid sons of Lampon and their kinsman won three pancration victories, one at the Isthmus, two at leafy Nemea.*—According to the usual interpretation τρεῖς is taken with ἀπ' Ἰσθμοῦ, and, as only one Isthmian victory is known, that of Phylacidas, the remaining two are attributed to Euthymenes. There is no authority for an Isthmian victory of Euthymenes except the schol. on *Nem.* v. 37, and that statement has no independent value, as it is merely a deduction from the passage before us. (My note on that passage must be corrected. I fell into the error of giving undue weight to the scholium.) But the decisive consideration is that, if τρεῖς qualifies νίκας ἀπ' Ἰσθμοῦ, the following τὰς δέ is perfectly indefinite and may mean any number from two upward. If anything is certain in such a matter, it is certain that Pindar told the exact number of such rare and important victories. It follows that τὰς δ' is determined by τρεῖς. The full phrase would be τρεῖς νίκας, τὰν μὲν ἀπ' Ἰσθμοῦ, τὰς δ' ἀπ' εὐφύλλου Νεμέας.—Mezger has gone wrong in inferring from l. 3 that Phylacidas won a victory at Nemea.

62. **μάτρως· ἀνὰ δ'**] Correction of E. Schmid for MSS. μάτρωες· ἂν δ'.—*They led up to light—what a share of hymns!* Schol. τὸ δὲ οἵαν θαυμαστικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁποίαν εἴρηκεν. οἷος is used in the same way in *Ol.* IX. 89.

63. **Ψαλυχιαδᾶν**] I have kept the reading of the MSS. E. Schmid Ψαλυχιδᾶν, of which Mommsen and others approve. But the substitution of two short syllables for a long (especially in a proper name) need cause no difficulty. There is another case, in this ode, of irregular correspondence, in the 7th verse of the first strophe.—Schol. Ψαλυχιάδαι δὲ φυλὴ ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἀφ' ἧς ὁ νικηφόρος. τὴν δὲ τῶν Ψαλυχιαδῶν φατρίαν τῇ τῶν Χαρίτων καλλίστῃ δρόσῳ καταβρέχουσι, φησὶ δὲ τοῖς ὕμνοις. For the metaphor see l. 21 above. For **δρόσῳ**, cp. *Pyth.* V. 99, ἀρετὰν δρόσῳ μαλθακᾷ ῥανθεῖσαν ὕμνων. For **ἄρδειν** cp. *Ol.* V. 23, ὄλβον ἄρδει.

65. **ὀρθώσαντες**] See above, *Isth.* III. B 38. Themistios was a kinsman of the victor, possibly his mother's father. A needless attempt has been made to distinguish this person from the Themistios who is mentioned in *Nem.* V. 50 as a boxer and pancratiast. **θεοφιλῆ**, *divinely favoured;* only here in Pindar, but elsewhere frequent.

66. **Λάμπων** κ.τ.λ.] *Lampon, bestowing 'study' on his 'works', holds in high honour that saying of Hesiod, and pointing the way exhorts his sons thereto.* The saying of Hesiod is μελέτη δέ τοι ἔργον ὀφέλλει (*Works and Days*, 382); Pindar's expression echoes without quoting it. Lampon's unwearying interest in athletics, though he was not a distinguished athlete himself, is meant.

ξυνὸν ἄστει κόσμον ἑῷ προσάγων, ἐπ. γ΄.
καὶ ξένων εὐεργεσίαις ἀγαπᾶται, 70
μέτρα μὲν γνώμᾳ διώκων, μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχων·
γλῶσσα δ' οὐκ ἔξω φρενῶν· φαίης κε Μένανδρον ἐν ἀθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν
Ναξίαν πέτραις ἐν ἄλλαις χαλκοδάμαντ' ἀκόναν.
πίσω σφε Δίρκας ἁγνὸν ὕδωρ, τὸ βαθύζωνοι κόραι

69. **ξυνὸν** κ.τ.λ.] *Attaching public honour to his city.* Schol. κοινὴν εὐδοξίαν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδι προσάπτων. **προσάγω** occurs only here in Pindar. It seems possible that the word may have been chosen to bring Lampon's works into connexion with the exploits of his sons, of whom **ἀνάγω** is used in l. 62.

70. **ἀγαπᾶται**] Elsewhere Pindar has ἀγαπάζω.—**ξένων** is the object of the verbal force in εὐεργεσίαις (so-called objective genitive). *His hospitalities to strangers render him beloved.*

71. **μέτρα** κ.τ.λ.] διώκων is opposed to κατέχων as endeavour to accomplishment: 'the aim of his judgment is measure, unto measure also he attaineth'. The doctrine of measure is thus stated by Hesiod (*Works and Days*, 639)

μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι· καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστος,

and κατέχων is equivalent to φυλασσόμενος. The subject was a favourite one with such poets as Theognis; and Pindar's words almost sound as if they were extracted from an elegiac distich: thus,

γνώμῃ μὲν μέτρα δίωκειν
μέτρα δὲ καὶ κατέχειν.

In *Nem.* XI. 47 we have θηρευέμεν with μέτρον.

72. **γλῶσσα** κ.τ.λ.] His tongue strays not outside the home of his wisdom, does not outrun his discretion. Schol. οὐδὲν ἄκαιρον φλυαρεῖ ἀλλ' ὃ σκέπτεται...§ οὐ προπετῶς φθέγγεται, he does not speak at random.

**φαίης κε** κ.τ.λ.] The reading of the MSS. is νιν ἄνδρ' ἐν ἀθληταῖσιν (which only requires Schmid's ἀεθληταῖσιν to be metrical). This was apparently the reading of Didymos and the scholiasts, who refer νιν to Lampon. Schol.: εἴποι δ' ἄν τις αὐτὸν τὸν Λάμπωνα εἶναι τοιοῦτον ἄνδρα ἐν τοῖς ἀθληταῖς οἵαν ἐν πέτραις ἑτερογενέσι Ναξίαν ἀκόνην δυνάμενον ἀθλητὰς μάλιστα παραθῆξαι. But ἄνδρ' has no force as a predicate and cannot be the subject of εἶναι. Hence Heyne emended ἀνδράσιν for ἄνδρ' ἐν and this has been very generally accepted. But the corruption is a most unlikely one. There is a further objection to the text. It is odd to find Lampon thus described in words which are applicable to a professional trainer. Moreover, some years before, the trainer of Pytheas was Menandros (*Nem.* V. 48). Lampon encouraged his sons in their athletic exercises and spared no expense; but we are not to suppose that he 'coached' Phylacidas. Mommsen has rightly restored Μένανδρον ἐν for νιν ἄνδρ' ἐν (on the strength of the Triclinian gloss τὸν ἀλείπτην Μένανδρον εἶναι ἔξοχον). To explain the reading of the MSS. we have only to assume the corruption of the first M to N. νιν and ἄνδρ' were obvious corrections of νεν and ανδρον. Mommsen's emendation is also accepted by Mezger.

73. **Ναξίαν**] Not of Naxos the island, but of Naxos the town in Crete, as the scholiast tells us. **χαλκοδάμαντ'**, *bronze-subjugating*, ἅπαξ εἰρημένον. D has χαλκοδάμαν τ'.—The simile reminds us of Horace's *fungar vice cotis*.

74. **πίσω** κ.τ.λ.] *I will give them a draught of Dirce's sacred water, which the deep-girdled maidens of golden-robed*

χρυσοπέπλου Μναμοσύνας ἀνέτειλαν παρ' εὐτειχέσιν Κάδμου πύλαις. 75

*Mnamosyne raised up beside the gates of the fair-walled city of Cadmus.*—**πίσω**, future of πιπίσκω. The prose word was ποτίζω. Observe the double accusative (and compare my note on *Nem.* I. 65). The Theban poet gives a draught of Theban song. For Mnemosyne, mother of the Muses, compare Terpander 3, σπένδωμεν ταῖς Μνάμας παισὶν Μώσαις, and *Nem.* VII. 15, where her epithet is λιπαράμπυξ. The golden peplos here was perhaps suggested by a work of art (so Mr Fennell). Pindar does not use χρυσόπεπλος elsewhere in his extant poems.

75. **ἀνέτειλαν**] *brought to light.* Cp. above, *Isth.* III B 65, and below VI. 5.

**εὐτειχής** means 'provided with fair walls' and is the proper epithet of a house or a city (cp. *Nem.* VII. 46 θεοῦ παρ' εὐτειχέα δόμον, *Ol.* VI. 1 εὐτειχεῖ προθύρῳ). Here **πύλαις** is used for the city so famous for its seven gates. Perhaps Pindar would not have used the phrase εὐτειχέσι πύλαις in the case of any other town than Thebes.

# ISTHMIAN VI.

## IN HONOUR OF A VICTORY IN THE PANCRATION AT ISTHMUS WON BY STREPSIADES OF THEBES.

## INTRODUCTION.

THERE were clouds[1] on the political horizon of Greece when Pindar wrote this ode for his fellow-countryman Strepsiades. In the streets of Thebes indeed there was joy; for the Thebans had won the battle of Tanagra, and had not yet been defeated at Oenophyta[2]. Elated by their triumph they were beginning to dream of future greatness; and perhaps were not very eager for peace. Pindar, already an old man, did not enter into this temper, though he fully shared in the jubilation over the victory. He was in favour of counsels of moderation, and deprecated the ambitious dream which might lure his country to a precipice.

Such is the mood of this ode which commemorates two events in a private family. Strepsiades had proved his powers as a pancratiast by gaining a victory in the Isthmian games. His uncle, Strepsiades also by name, had proved his valour and patriotism by fighting in the foremost rank at the recent battle, and fallen as he fought. This circumstance gave the poet an opportunity for saying what he felt in regard to the general situation of affairs.

The hymn may be divided into three parts, corresponding to the three

[1] ἐν ταύτᾳ νεφέλᾳ, l. 27.

[2] This is the view of Mezger. No other theory harmonizes with the tone of the ode. Boeckh (followed by Dissen etc.) placed the ode after Oenophyta, but Mezger's objections are decisive. After a defeat ὁ δ' ἀθανάτων μὴ θρασσέτω φθόνος (l. 39) would have been bitter mockery indeed.—The battle of Tanagra was fought in Nov. 457, and that of Oenophyta just two months later (beginning of 456). Thus the Isthmian victory of Strepsiades must have been gained in 458. The ode then was not composed until a year and a half had elapsed. We may take it that the death of Strepsiades the elder suggested a hymn in his memory, and it was then decided that the Isthmian achievement should be also celebrated by a κοινὸν θάλος.

metrical systems. The first deals with the ancient history of Thebes; the second with present events—the Isthmian victory, the war and the death of the victor's kinsman; the third looks forward to the future, discouraging ambitious projects, and expressing a hope that a Pythian crown may fall to the lot of Strepsiades.

1. *The Past.*—The ode opens with a numbering of the glories of Theba, the blessed. The birth of Dionysus, described as χαλκοκρότου πάρεδρον Δαμάτερος εὐρυχαίταν—the visit of Zeus to the house of Amphitryon, with the seed of Heracles in his loins, and coming perhaps, according to some rare legend, in a shower of golden snow—the wise counsels of Tiresias—the fame of the horseman Iolaus, and of the mighty Sown Men,—the repulse of the Seven who came to sack her city,—the good help which her sons gave to Lacedaemon in their southern settlement and especially in taking Amyclae,—all these episodes in her history, Theba may remember with pleasure. But such events demand a poet, for what is not sung passes out of the minds of men.

2. *The Present.*—And therefore it is well that the recent exploit of Strepsiades on the Isthmus should be celebrated in a hymn. The Muses have twined a wreath of violets for him and his uncle of the same name. They are both to share the same wreath. For his uncle, to whom death was dealt by Ares of the brazen shield—

χάλκασπις ᾧ πότμον μὲν Ἄρης ἔμιξεν—

deserves a reward too. Praise is owed to all the patriots who in this dark crisis have taken part in the defence of their country so seriously menaced. The fallen Strepsiades, son of Diodotus, is likened to Meleager and Hector, and a remarkable expression is chosen, as it were to shed flowers over his corpse:—

34 εὐανθέ' ἀπέπνευσας ἁλικίαν
προμάχων ἀν' ὅμιλον.

But now after the storm of war there is a calm. One Strepsiades has fallen; but to another Strepsiades Poseidon has given an Isthmian victory.

3. *The Future.*—We must hope that Thebes exalted in her prosperity may not draw upon herself the envy of the immortals: so it is clearly meant, though no names are mentioned. It is better to make no far-reaching plans for the future, but to enjoy the pleasures that come to us from day to day. Such, Pindar professes, is his own 'philosophy' of life; and he states it in remarkable words which might be taken as a motto by a disciple of the Cyrenaic school;

40 ὅ τι τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον διώκων
ἕκαλος ἔπειμι γῆρας ἔς τε τὸν μόρσιμον
αἰῶνα.

He holds up the fate of Bellerophon as a warning against aiming too high. Sweetness may easily be turned into bitterness; and mortals must remember

what they are, the only sort of immortality which they may reach being that which song confers. This is brought out by a signal.

43 *τὰ μακρὰ δ' εἴ τις*
*παπταίνει, βραχὺς ἐξικέσθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἕδραν*
18 *ὅ τι μὴ σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον*
*κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν ἐξίκηται ζυγέν.*

A warning is also implied that Thebes must not be seduced into high-soaring hopes by recollections of her mythical glories, on the strength of the gods and heroes who were in olden time associated with her. Man is too small of stature to reach the abode of the gods

*χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἕδραν,*

and Dionysus, though he was born at Thebes, is a god:

*χαλκοκρότου πάρεδρον Δαμάτερος.*

Zeus came down to Theba, but Theba cannot go up to Zeus—

*τὸν φέρτατον θεῶν.*

But there may be pleasures in store for her citizens. We may pray that Apollo, his *golden* hair wreathed with laurel, may be gracious to Strepsiades; though we cannot expect Zeus to come again in *golden* showers (cp. 5 and 49). We have strewn flowers over the grave of him who fell at Tanagra; let us hope that his younger kinsman may soon win another wreath, not in war, but at the Pythian games,—

*τεαῖσιν ἁμίλλαις*
*εὐανθέα καὶ Πυθόϊ στέφανον*[1].

[1] It is to be observed that the emphatic epithet in the last line metrically corresponds to the same epithet in l. 34, the last line of the second epode. This responsion was noticed and appreciated by Mezger. The same adjective *εὐανθής* occurs in *Olymp.* VI. 84 (last line of epode 4), where it is also significant, responding to *εὐτερπὲς ἄνθος*, 105 (last line of epode 5).

## METRICAL ANALYSIS.

### Strophe.

(*Rhythm: iambic.*)

⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–⏑––<br>
⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–⏑–⏑––⏑⏓<br>
––⏑–⏓–⏑⏑–⏑––<br>
––⏑⏑–⏑–⏑–⏒<br>
*v.* 5 –––⏑⏑–⏑–––⏑⏑–⏑–⏓–⏑–⏑⏑–––⏑–⏑⏓

M. Schmidt has pointed out that the rhythm is iambic. He divides the strophe into two parts, each containing 18 feet, and the point of division being at the end of *v.* 3.

### Epode.

(*Rhythm: dactyloepitritic.*)

–⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–⏑–⏑⏓<br>
––⏑⏑–⏑––⏑⏑–⏒<br>
––⏑⏑–⏑–<br>
⏑⏑–⏑⏑–⏑–⏑–⏒<br>
*v.* 5 –––⏑⏑–⏑––⏑⏑–⏑⏓<br>
––⏑⏑–⏓<br>
––⏑⏑––⏑–⏑⏑⏓

The construction is 'mesodic-palinodic', according to M. Schmidt, who gives the scheme

6 · 10 · 5 · 10 · 6

He adds 'Dieses Epinikon ist übrigens nach Pyth. x. das zweite, seiner Abfassungszeit nach sicher bestimmbare Gedicht, und fällt Ol. 70. 4 oder 2. Wir werden also diesen Baustyl als einen althergebrachten betrachten dürfen'. But the date of Heyne and Bergk (506) is very improbable.

## ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙ ϛ'.

## ΣΤΡΕΨΙΑΔῌ ΘΗΒΑΙῼ

### ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙῼ.

*Τίνι τῶν πάρος, ὦ μάκαιρα Θήβα,* *στρ. α'.*
*καλῶν ἐπιχωρίων μάλιστα θυμὸν τεὸν*
*εὔφρανας; ἤ ῥα χαλκοκρότου πάρεδρον*
*Δαμάτερος ἀνίκ' εὐρυχαίταν*
*ἄντειλας Διόνυσον, ἢ χρυσῷ μεσονύκτιον νίφοντα δεξαμένα τὸν*
*φέρτατον θεῶν,* 5

1. **τίνι** κ.τ.λ.] *In which of the past glories of thy city, O Theba, didst thou most blithely cheer thy soul?*—For Theba daughter of Asopos and Metopa cp. *Ol.* VI. 85. See also *Isth.* I. 1, and III. A 12. **τῶν πάρος ἐπιχωρίων**, 'the history of thy city'.

3. **ἤ ῥα** κ.τ.λ.] *Was it, when thou didst raise to fulfilment Dionysus of the broad-flowing tresses, who shareth the throne of Demeter queen of the ringing brass?*—For ἤ ῥα in the first member of an alternative cp. *Pyth.* XI. 38. **χαλκόκροτος** (used of a bronze-hoofed horse by Aristophanes) refers, according to Müller, not to the κρόταλα *cymbals*, such as were used in the worship of Cybele, but to bronze instruments called ἠχεῖα, which were sounded in the worship of Demeter.—πάρεδρος has always ε̆ in Pindar (*Ol.* II. 84, VIII. 22, *Pyth.* IV. 4, *Nem.* VII. 1). It is unnecessary to illustrate the association of Dionysus and Demeter.—**εὐρυχαίταν** is ἅπαξ εἰρημένον. For **ἄντειλας** cp. *Isth.* V. 75.

5. **ἢ χρυσῷ** κ.τ.λ.] *Or in the hour when the lord of the gods was thy guest in a midnight shower of gold.*—For the dative **χρυσῷ** a line of Nicophon is cited by Liddell and Scott (*ap.* Athenaeum, VI. 269)

νιφέτω μὲν ἀλφίτοις
ψακαζέτω δ' ἄρτοισιν ὑέτω δ' ἔτνει.

**μεσονύκτιον**, not adverbial as in Theocritus, but adjective.—According to the text of the MSS., **ὁπότ'** in l. 6, this golden descent of Zeus took place on the occasion when he wooed Alcmena. But we never hear elsewhere of Zeus coming to Thebes as he came to Argos. A scholium suggests that Pindar has transferred to the tale of Alcmena the leading feature of the tale of Danaa. In *Ol.* VII. 34 however we find the king of the gods snowing gold at Rhodes, when Athena was born. We may infer that this phenomenon was

ὁπότ' Ἀμφιτρύωνος ἐν θυρέτροις  ἀντ. α'.
σταθεὶς ἄλοχον μετῆλθεν, Ἡρακλείοις γοναῖς;
ἦτ' ἀμφὶ πυκναῖς Τειρεσίαο βουλαῖς;
ἦτ' ἀμφ' Ἰόλαον ἱππόμητιν;
ἢ Σπαρτῶν ἀκαμαντολογχᾶν; ἢ ὅτε καρτερᾶς Ἄδραστον ἐξ
ἀλαλᾶς ἄμπεμψας ὀρφανὸν  10

imagined to take place at critical moments in the life of Zeus, and was not confined to the Argos episode, though that became the most celebrated instance. Still, it is odd that we should hear nowhere else of gold in connexion with the famous story of the begetting of Heracles. It is quite possible that ὁπότ' is corrupt, and that we should read ἢ ὅτ', as Mr Tyrrell proposes. In that case the shower of gold would be connected with a visit of Zeus to Theba herself.

6. **ἐν θυρέτροις**] Schol. κατὰ τὰ πρόθυρα. **ἐπὶ** is the preposition in *Nem.* I. 19 ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις.—**σταθείς.** The moment is described when Zeus first appeared to Alcmene standing at the door, before entering. **μετῆλθε**, *sought* (in love).—**γοναῖς** has been explained in two ways, (1) as dative of purpose, equivalent to ἐπὶ γοναῖς, (2) as instrumental dative, like *Nem.* X. 69 ἐφορμαθεὶς δ' ἄρ' ἄκοντι θοῷ ἤλασε κ.τ.λ. (Dissen). The second of these explanations is preferable, but not wholly satisfactory. In the passage in the Tenth Nemean the dative is determined by the following ἤλασε. The construction is far simpler. Ἡρακλείοις γοναῖς depends on εὔφρανας θυμόν, which is carried to each succeeding question. *Was thy soul made glad by the seed of Heracles, when Zeus sought Amphitryon's wife?* The dative with εὐφραίνω is common: we have it in *Pyth.* IX. 16.

8. **ἦτ'**] MSS. ἢ ὅτ'. Bergk restored ἦτ' for ἤτοι in this and in the following verse. The corruption was caused by ἢ ὅτε in l. 10, where it is quite in place.—For **ἀμφί** with the dative after εὔφρανας θυμόν, compare ἀμφὶ βουσὶ χολωθεὶς *Nem.* X. 60.—MSS. Τειρεσίαο πυκιναῖς βουλαῖς, which does not scan. Heyne emended πυκναῖς Τειρεσίαο βουλαῖς, and this transposition has been generally accepted, but Mr Fennell reads Τειρεσία πυκιναῖσι βουλαῖς, suggesting that Τειρεσία may be scanned as a molossus (– – –). Mr Fennell's proposal seems to involve least change; he only adds one letter and strikes out another, whereas Heyne both struck out a letter and transposed two words. Transposition is indeed always hazardous. But one does not see why Τειρεσία should have become Τειρεσίαο. There would be more chance of Τειρεσίαο becoming Τειρεσία.

9. **ἦτ' ἀμφὶ κ.τ.λ.**] MSS. ἢ ὅτ'. See last note.—**ἀμφί** with accusative as in *Nem.* I. 54 εὐθὺς δ' ἀπήμων κραδία κᾶδος ἀμφ' ἀλλότριον. There is a shade of difference between the uses of ἀμφί with dative and with accusative, which is well illustrated by this and the foregoing line. ἀμφί is used with the dative when the object is defined or narrowed, as it were, to a single point; it takes the accusative when the object expresses a sphere. ἀμφὶ βουσὶ χολωθεὶς suggests a perfectly defined cause of wrath; the wise counsels of Teiresias were definite and suggest nothing beyond themselves. But ἀμφ' Ἰόλαον means 'in the whole career of Iolaos'. And so κᾶδος ἀμφ' ἀλλότριον means '*in the atmosphere of* alien sorrow'.—**ἱππόμητιν**, equivalent to ἱππηλάτην, is not found elsewhere.

10. **ἢ Σπαρτῶν κ.τ.λ.**] The genitive is used after εὔφρανας, on the analogy of verbs of grief and anger. Pindar takes

*μυρίων ἑτάρων ἐς Ἄργος ἵππιον;* ἐπ. αʹ.
*ἢ Δωρίδ' ἀποικίαν οὕνεκεν ὀρθῷ*
*ἔστασας ἐπὶ σφυρῷ*
*Λακεδαιμονίων, ἕλον δ' Ἀμύκλας*
*Αἰγεΐδαι σέθεν ἔκγονοι, μαντεύμασι Πυθίοις;* 15

pleasure in using a new construction with each alternative. We have (1) ἀνίκα, (2) dative, (3) ἀμφί with dat., (4) ἀμφί with accus., (5) genitive, (6) ὅτε, (7) οὕνεκεν.—Σπαρτῶν 'the Sowed Men', sprung from the seed of dragon's teeth. **ἀκαμαντολογχᾶν**, *with indefatigable lances*, coined by Pindar for this passage. He is fond of such coinages. We have ἀκαμαντομάχας (*Pyth.* IV. 171), ἀκαμαντόποδος (*Ol.* III. 3), ἀκαμαντοχάρμας (*fr.* 184).

**ἢ ὅτε** κ.τ.λ.] *Or when thou didst send back from the mighty noise of the wild fray Adrastus, reft of countless comrades, to Argos rich in steeds.*—For the war of Adrastus, it is enough to refer to Pindar's *Ninth Nemean*, the *Seven against Thebes* of Aeschylus, the first choral ode of Sophocles' *Antigone*, and the *Phoenissae* of Euripides.—Pindar has other remarkable expressions which we may compare with **καρτερᾶς ἐξ ἀλαλᾶς**: in *Nem.* III. 60 δορίκτυπον ἀλαλὰν Λυκίων, in *frag.* 208 of dancers μανίαις τ' ἀλαλαῖς τ' ὀρινόμενοι ῥιψαύχενι σὺν κλόνῳ. 'Αλαλά is the daughter of Πόλεμος in *frag.* 78.—For καρτερᾶς (B), D has κρατερᾶς.—**ἀντεμψας**, B.

11. **ἵππιον**] Pindar uses both this form and ἵππειος.—**ἑτάρων ἐς** is the correction of Schmid for MSS. ἑταίρων εἰς.

12. **Δωρίδ' ἀποικίαν**] *The Dorian colony of the Lacedaemonians* means Sparta and her territory. The new settlement was not firmly established, until Amyclae, the stronghold of the Achaeans, which lay a little south of Lacedaemon, on Lacedaemon's river, was taken. To capture this fortress the Spartans, by the advice of the Pythian oracle, sought the help of the Aegidae who were, according to Pindar, a Theban family. Others told other stories about the origin of the Aegids. Some said they were a *phyle* of Aegina, and that their connexion with Thebes began after their work in the Peloponnesus. Others said that a Theban named Aegeus aided the Heraclidae and that his descendants lived on at Sparta. Others again brought the Aegidae, who took Amyclae, from Athens. The following scholium seems clearest: καὶ εἰσὶν Αἰγεΐδαι φατρία Θηβαίων ἀφ' ἧς ἧκόν τινες εἰς Σπάρτην Λακεδαιμονίοις βοηθήσοντες ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀμυκλαεῖς πολέμῳ ἡγεμόνι χρησάμενοι Τιμομάχῳ ὃς πρῶτος μὲν πάντα τὰ πρὸς πόλεμον διέταξε Λακεδαιμονίοις μεγάλων δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἠξιώθη τιμῶν. The story is said to be told in Aristotle's lost *Constitution of the Laconians.* But a further question arises as to the correctness of Pindar's view that the taking of Amyclae by Aegidae was the last act in the Dorian settlement of Laconia. It does not concern us here; but it may be noted that according to Müller (*Orchom.*) their capture of Amyclae was before the Dorian Wandering.

**ὀρθῷ ἐπὶ σφυρῷ**] Compare *Ol.* XIII. 72 ἀνὰ δ' ἔπαλτ' ὀρθῷ ποδί. Dissen quotes Callimachus, *Hymn to Artemis*, 128 ἐπὶ σφυρὸν ὀρθὸν ἀνέστη, and Horace's *recto stet talo.* The phrase means no more than ὀρθὰν ἔστασας.—MSS. οὕνεκα, Thiersch **οὕνεκεν**, Mommsen and Christ οὕνεκεν.

15. **Αἰγεΐδαι**] For the connexion of the Theban Aegidae with the colonization of Thera, see *Pythian* V. 70 ἵκοντο Θήρανδε φῶτες Αἰγεΐδαι κ.τ.λ.—D has the strange reading αἰδεῖσθαι. It is stated in the scholia that some wrote Ἀργεΐδαι.—For Πυθίοις MSS. have Πυθίοισι.

ἀλλ' ἁ παλαιὰ γὰρ
εὕδει χάρις, ἀμνάμονες δὲ βροτοί,

ὅ τι μὴ σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον  στρ. β'.
κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν ἐξίκηται ζυγέν.
κώμαζ' ἔπειτεν ἀδυμελεῖ σὺν ὕμνῳ  20
καὶ Στρεψιάδᾳ· φέρει γὰρ Ἰσθμοῖ
νίκαν παγκρατίου· σθένει τ' ἔκπαγλος ἰδεῖν τε μορφάεις· ἄγει τ'
ἀρετὰν οὐκ αἴσχιω φυᾶς.

16. **ἀλλ' ἁ** κ.τ.λ.] 'Yes, the past glories of Theba are many; but, if they be not sung, they sleep in the forgetfulness of men.' For the idiomatic ellipsis expressed by ἀλλὰ γάρ compare *Isth.* III. B 16.—The MSS. have ἀλλά. Bergk's **ἀλλ' ἁ** can hardly be called a change. Compare the corresponding lines of the second and third epodes, where corruptions have also crept into the text. **παλαιά** is to be scanned as an anapaest.

17. **ἀμνάμονες** κ.τ.λ.] *and whatsoever unlinked with sounding streams of verses reach not the crowning height of Wit, passeth out of the memory of men.*—I conjectured in the Introduction to my ed. of the *Nemean Odes* that there may be a set of second meanings behind these words; but the supposition is perhaps unnecessary. **ἄωτος** means (1) *fine gloss, perfection, height* and (2) *breath.* The first meaning, in conjunction with ἄκρον and ἐξίκηται, suggested the lofty summit of wisdom's hill, ascended in the car of the Muses (ζυγέν), and **ῥοαῖσιν** did not seem to harmonize with this figure. All the other words seemed to lend themselves to a metaphor from streams and breezes, **ἄωτον ἄκρον** being a variation on the Homeric **ἀκρ-αής, ζυγέν** suggesting the ζυγά of a ship, which, borne on the streams of verses, wins (with **ἐξίκηται** cp. **ἵκμενος**) a breeze to convey it. But it is unwise to press the metaphor underlying ῥοαῖσιν and ζυγέν.

In these words Aristarchus, as we learn from the scholia, found an allusion to disdain or neglect shewn to the Thebans by the Lacedaemonians (after Tanagra?): ἀχαριστουμένων τι τῶν Θηβαίων ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων. The idea was taken up by Boeckh and modern editors who suppose that the hymn was written after the Theban defeat at Oenophyta. But, as Mezger has seen, the argument is quite intelligible without the hypothesis of any such allusion.

20. **ἔπειτεν**] restored by Pauw; MSS. ἔπειτ' ἐν. The form ἔπειτεν occurs in two other passages, and in both it has suffered corruption in most MSS. In *Nem.* III. 54 καὶ ἔπειτεν Ἀσκλήπιον all the MSS. give ἔπειτ' ἐν or ἔπει· τόν, except V and $D_2$ which have kept the true word. So in *Pyth.* IV. 211 ἔπειτεν ἤλυθον, preserved in four MSS., has been altered in most to ἔπειτ' ἐνήλυθον.—**ἀδυμελεῖ**, see *Nem.* II. 25 (φωνᾷ). It qualifies φόρμιγξ in *Ol.* VII. 11, κόσμον in *Ol.* XI. 14, κώμῳ in *Pyth.* VIII. 70.—**κωμάζω**, used without an object here, takes the accusative in *Isth.* III. B 90 and elsewhere.

21. **καί**] For Strepsiades as well as for the ancient worthies of Theban legend.

**φέρει**] *he is freighted with, is winner of;* compare *Nem.* III. 18 and IV. 30. For **παγκρατίου**, see above IV. 19.

22. **σθένει** κ.τ.λ.] *Both marvellous in strength and comely to look upon; and he carries* (as it were, on deck) *excellence matching the favour of his form.*—The figure in **ἄγει** is from the freight of a ship (cp. φέρει in last line) as is clearly

*φλέγεται δε Ϝιοπλόκοισι Μοίσαις,* *ἀντ. βʹ.*
*μάτρωΐ θ' ὁμωνύμῳ δέδωκε κοινὸν θάλος,*
*χάλκασπις ᾧ πότμον μὲν Ἄρης ἔμιξεν,* 25
*τιμὰ δ' ἀγαθοῖσιν ἀντίκειται.*

shewn by *Pyth.* III. 73, which commentators have strangely omitted to compare; *εἰ κατέβαν ὑγίειαν ἄγων χρυσέαν*. The naval term *κατέβαν* proves the exact meaning of *ἄγων* there; and it is by far the most appropriate meaning here. The scholium *φέρει δὲ καὶ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετὴν οὐκ αἰσχύνουσαν τὴν τοῦ σώματος εὐμορφίαν* is not wrong, but it does not appear clearly that the writer grasped the metaphor. I have adopted **αἰσχίω** (the reading of ε, ζ) for *αἴσχιον* (B, *αἴσχθιον* D). The corruption perhaps arose through a substitution of the form *αἰσχίονα*, at a later stage corrected to *αἴσχιον* for the sake of the metre. For forms in ω cp. I. 63.—Mr Fennell, retaining *αἴσχιον*, explains *ἄγει* 'holds virtue to be as fair a possession'; Mezger translates 'besitzt'; Bergk reading *αἰσχίων* conjectures λιλεῖ 'desires'.

For **μορφάεις** (only here in Pindar) B has *μορφᾶεσσ'* and D *μορφάεσ'*. Bergk observes: 'corruptelae ansam dedit *μορφάες* ex antiqua scriptura residuum (cp. Cramer *An. Ox.* II. 174: *Δωριεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ ῑ προφέρουσιν αὐτὰ οἷον ἀστερόες αἱματόες,...*), sed mirum accidit hoc criticos propagavisse vocali littera subsequente'; and he uses this consideration in favour of his guess λιλεῖ.—For **ἔκπαγλος** see above v. 54.

23. **φλέγεται**] *He burns bright*, 'is illuminated'. See my note on *Nem.* X. 2 *φλέγεται δ' ἀρεταῖς*, and *Nem.* VI. 38 *Χαρίτων ὁμάδῳ φλέγεν*.—The MSS. have *ἰοπλοκάμοισι* in defiance of metre. Schmid's correction *ἰοβοστρύχοισι* has been generally accepted, but seems unlikely, as *βόστρυχος* was a too familiar word to be ousted by an interpretation. I therefore (like Christ) follow Bergk in reading **Ϝιοπλόκοισι**. The corruption was most natural. It was taken for granted that the word should refer to violet-hued tresses of the Muses and the change was a slight one. But the Muses were here represented as weaving the violets for violet crowns such as they wore themselves; cp. Theognis l. 250, *ἀγλαὰ Μουσάων δῶρα Ϝιοστεφάνων*. Here the wreath is for Strepsiades; see next line.

24. **μάτρωΐ θ'** *κ.τ.λ.*] *And to his like-named uncle he has given a share of their* (violet) *bloom*, that is a part of the hymn. **κοινὸν θάλος** (lit. 'a wreath, common to both') confirms to certainty the emendation *Ϝιοπλόκοισι*.—MSS. *μάτρῳ*, but ε, ζ rightly *μάτρωΐ*.

25. **ᾧ** *κ.τ.λ.*] *to whom brazen-shielded Ares communicated doom; yet honour is the prize of the brave*. The force of **μέν**—**δ'** is that what was death for Strepsiades also proved his glory; hence the place of *μέν* after *πότμον*, not after *ᾧ*. Observe too the emphatic position of **χάλκασπις** (see *Introduction*).—For *Ἄρης* D has *ἄρ'*.—**ἔμιξεν**. We have the alternative construction (*τινά τινι* instead of *τινί τι*) in *Nem.* IV. 21, *Ol.* I. 22 (*κράτει προσέμιξε δεσπόταν*). Mezger's rendering 'Ares mischte ihm das Todesloos' can hardly be right.—The lot of death came to Strepsiades at the battle of Tanagra 457 B.C. See *Introduction*.

26. **ἀντίκειται**] Compare *κεῖτο*, *Isth.* I. 27. Mr Fennell thinks that the force of *ἀντι-* is 'in return for their life'. It seems to me that it is more likely to be local; the prize is set opposite, as it were, to those who strive for it.—The scholia point to another reading *τιμᾷ*. Bergk has conjectured that the two variants may come from an original *τιμαί*, which would give a *schema Pindaricum*.

γὰρ σαφὲς ὅστις ἐν ταύτᾳ νεφέλᾳ χάλαζαν αἵματος πρὸ φίλας πάτρας ἀμύνεται,

ὸν ἀντιφέρων ἐναντίῳ στρατῷ, ἐπ. β'.
ὶν γενεᾷ μέγιστον κλέος αὔξων
, τ' ἀπὸ καὶ θανών· 30
έ, Διοδότοιο παῖ, μαχατὰν
ον Μελέαγρον, αἰνέων δὲ καὶ Ἕκτορα

ἴστω κ.τ.λ.] *For let whoso in this f war defendeth his dear land against ilstorm of blood, and beareth ruin t the host of the adversaries, be cer- that he increaseth to greatness the of his fellow-citizens,—both living hen he is dead.*—**νεφέλᾳ**, schol. ἐν Ἄρεος νεφέλῃ, τουτέστιν ἐν τῷ πο- Somewhat otherwise in *Nem.* IX. , a passage which bears a striking blance to this;

μύνειν **λοιγὸν** Ἐνυαλίου. παῦροι δὲ
βουλεῦσαι **φόνου**
αρποδίου **νεφέλαν** τρέψαι ποτὶ δυσ-
μενέων ἀνδρῶν στίχας
ερσὶ καὶ ψυχᾷ δυνατοί.

y note there for **λοιγόν**. For χά- cp. *Isth.* IV. 50, and *Oed. Rex* ὄμβρος χαλάζης αἱματοῦς ἐτέγγετο. o Simonides 106 λοῦσεν φοινίσσᾳ Ἄρης ψακάδι.—**πρὸ** Schmid, πρὸς

**ἀντιφέρων**] MSS. ἀμύνων, which, tempted to think, came in from the l passage *Nem.* IX. 37 ἀμύνειν Ἐνυαλίου. The schol. interprets ον φέρων ὄλεθρον τοῖς πολεμίοις. hief emendations are: ἄντα φέρων ch, ἀντιφέρων Bergk, ἀντιτίνων ann, ἀμπεπαλών Mommsen, λοιγὸν ἐναντίῳ στρατῷ φέρων Kayser (Har- rewrites the whole passage). Of Bergk's ἀντιφέρων (he compares ἐπ' Αἰτωλοῖς ἀντιφέρων πόλεμον in igram of Damagêtus *Anthol.* VII. eems the most likely. But it is e that such a simple expression, ing no interpretation, should have disappeared so entirely in the MSS. in favour of a word obviously impossible owing to the preceding ἀμύνεται. The parallel passage in the Ninth Nemean, quoted in the last note, suggests that Pindar may have written ἄντα τρέπων.

29. **γενεᾷ**] *nation*, as in *Ol.* XI. 15 τῶν Ἐπιζεφυρίων Λοκρῶν γενεὰν ἀλέγων. For **αὔξων** cp. *Pyth.* X. 10. **μέγιστον** is predicate.

30. **ζώων**] Pindar always uses ζώω, never ζάω.—The order **ἀπὸ καὶ θανών** for καὶ ἀποθανών is strange. It almost looks like a survival of days when καί, like its kinswords τε, *que*, Ssk. *ca*, might come after the word which it linked. Perhaps this passage indicates the origin of the phrase τε καί. The original form may have been πατήρ τε μήτηρ καί, and the place of καί in the alternative expression καὶ πατὴρ καὶ μήτηρ have produced the form πατήρ τε καὶ μήτηρ, which is curious when one comes to think of it. Mr Tyrrell suggests ζωῶν τ' ἄπο, 'both from the (mouths of the) living and after death'.

31. **Διοδότοιο**] The first syllable of the name, naturally short, is lengthened here in arsis. Bergk quotes Δῑοφάνης from an epigram published in Rangabé's *Antiq. Hell.* II. 988. Diodotus is the father of Strepsiades the elder.—For **μαχατάν** cp. *Nem.* II. 13. Meleager is ἀρηίφιλος in I 550.

32. **αἰνέων**] *rivalling, imitating, aemulatus.* See *Appendix A, note* 5 of my *Nemean Odes.*—Meleager, son of Aetolian Oeneus, met his death in the war be-

ἴσ'

λοιγὸ
ἀστῶν
ζώων
τὺ δέ,
αἰνέων

27. ...
*cloud of* ...
*the hails*
*against t*
*tified tha*
*glory of*
*and when*
τῇ τοῦ "A
λέμῳ. S
37, 38, a
resemblan

*ἀμφ' Ἀμφιάρειον*
*εὐανθέ' ἀπέπνευσας ἁλικίαν*

*προμάχων ἀν' ὅμιλον, ἔνθ' ἄριστοι* στρ. γ'. 35

tween the Aetolians and Curetes, *Κουρήτων τε μεσηγὺ καὶ Αἰτωλῶν μεγαθύμων* (I 549). Phoenix, in his tale of Meleager, does not get so far as his death, and we must go to Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* I. 8, 3: *ἐξελθόντος δὲ Μελεάγρου καί τινας τῶν Θεστίου παίδων φονεύσαντος Ἀλθαίαν ἀράσασθαι κατ' αὐτοῦ· τὸν δὲ ὀργιζόμενον οἴκοι μένειν. ἤδη δὲ τῶν πολεμίων τοῖς τείχεσι προσπελαζόντων καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν ἀξιούντων μεθ' ἱκετηρίας βοηθεῖν μόλις πεισθέντα ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς ἐξελθεῖν καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς κτείναντα τῶν Θεστίου παίδων ἀποθανεῖν μαχόμενον.* The point of the comparison of Strepsiades to Meleager and Hector is that all three warriors fell fighting for their country.

33. **ἀμφ' Ἀμφιάρειον**] The MSS. give *Ἀμφιάραόν τε* which (not to speak of metrical difficulties) yields no sense. Amphiaraos did not fall fighting for his country, and, save so far as he was a warrior, has no claim to be admitted into the fellowship of Meleager, Hector and Strepsiades. He met his death taking part in an expedition, which did not concern him, against the very country which Strepsiades died for. One of the Seven who marched against Thebes would have been an infelicitous choice indeed as a model for the Theban patriot. The corruption has given Bergk the opportunity of making one of his most brilliant emendations. He saw that *Ἀμφιάραόν* concealed an indication of the place where Strepsiades fell and read *Ἀμφιάρειον*, 'temple of Amphiaraus', between Tanagra and Oropus, cp. Strabo IX. 404 *καὶ ἡ Γραῖα δ' ἐστὶ τόπος Ὠρωποῦ πλησίον καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου κ.τ.λ.* Cp. IX. 399 *ἐνταῦθα δέ που καὶ τὸ Ἀμφιαράειόν ἐστι τετιμημένον ποτὲ μαντεῖον, ὅπου φυγόντα τὸν Ἀμφιάρεων, ὥς φησι Σοφοκλῆς κ.τ.λ.* In support of this restoration it is to be observed (1) that there is no mention of Amphiaraos in the scholia though Meleager and Hector are mentioned (Abel, p. 472): *σὺ δέ, Διοδότοιο παῖ, ἐν ἐπαίνῳ τιθέμενος Μελέαγρόν τε καὶ Ἕκτορα καὶ τὰς τούτων ζηλῶν ἀρετὰς κατὰ πόλεμον κ.τ.λ.*: and (2) that the rare *Ἀμφιάρειον* was inevitably exposed to corruption at the hands of late Pindaric copyists to whom *Ἀμφιάραος* was familiar. —I have however modified Bergk's restoration: he read *ἀν' Ἀμφιάρειον*, but *ἀνά* is not the right preposition here; though it occurs again in this very sentence with its right meaning: *προμάχων ἀν' ὅμιλον*. See *Appendix H*. I have therefore restored ΑΜΦΑΜΦΙΑΡΕΙΟΝ. *ἀμφί* is just what is required. Compare *Pyth.* X. 56 *ἀμφὶ Πηνειόν*, IV. 180 *ἀμφὶ Παγγαίου θέμεθλα*. And **ἀμφ'** is confirmed by the circumstance that the double *αμφ* facilitated the corruption. ΑΜΦΑΜΦΙΑΡΕΙΟΝ became ΑΜΦΙΑΡΕΙΟΝ, which was naturally taken for the name of the hero, and the addition of the copula was necessary for the construction. ΑΛΛΑΠΑΛΑΙΑΓΑΡ, the corresponding line in the first epode, caused no difficulty, and l. 50 only required the addition of *ιν* to the *ἀμίλλαις* to make it suit.—Mezger accepts Bergk's restoration.

34. **εὐανθέ'**] Strepsiades was still in the spring of his life. Cp. *Ol.* I. 67 *πρὸς εὐάνθεμον δ' ὅτε φυὰν λάχναι νιν μέλαν γένειον ἔρεφον.* See below l. 51, where the word is echoed, but in a literal sense. For **ἀπέπνευσας** cp. *Nem.* I. 47. Dissen compares Simonides 115 *ἡνίκ' ἀφ' ἱμερτὴν ἔπνεεν ἡλικίην.*

35. **προμάχων**] Strepsiades fought *ἐν προμάχοισιν*, among the foremost fighters. For **ὅμιλον** cp. *Nem.* IX. 21.

**ἔνθ' ἄριστοι κ.τ.λ.**] *Where men most*

ἔσχον πολέμοιο νεῖκος ἐσχαταις ἐλπίσιν.
ἔτλαν δὲ πένθος οὐ φατόν· ἀλλὰ νῦν μοι
ΓαιάϝοχοςΓ εὐδίαν ὄπασσεν
ἐκ χειμῶνος. ἀείσομαι χαίταν στεφάνοισιν ἁρμόζων· ὁ δ' ἀθανά-
    των μὴ θρασσέτω φθόνος.

ὅ τι τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον διώκων   ἀντ. γ'. 40
ἕκαλος ἔπειμι γῆρας ἔς τε τὸν μόρσιμον

*brave sustained the shock of war by the hopes of despair.* For πολέμοιο νεῖκος cp. N 271 ὁππότε νεῖκος ὀρώρηται πολέμοιο.

36. For **ἔσχον** Dissen quotes Ξ 57 οἱ δ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶ θοῇσι μάχην ἄλιαστον ἔχουσι νωλεμές. **ἐσχάταις ἐλπίσιν** (instrumental) are the last hopes which a man has before he ceases to hope altogether; as it were, the straws at which a drowning man clutches. [Mr Tyrrell suggests, 'with soaring spirit', cp. *Nem.* X. 32.] ἔσχον (the paronomasia **ἔσχον : ἐσχάταις** is perhaps intentional, cp. *Nem.* X. 33) expresses the tenacity of the Thebans in standing their ground: the battle was hardly won. —B gives ἐσχάταις ἐπ' ἐλπίσιν, and this was read by the scholiast who wrote ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔσχατα ἐπελπίζοντες ὅ ἐστιν ἀπολέσθαι καὶ μὴ ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὑποστελλόμενοι. (So Mezger explains 'auch auf den Tod gefasst'.) D has ἐσχάτοισιν ἐπ' ἐλπίδιν. The *editio Romana* has the reading in the text, which is required by the metre. ἐπὶ was a natural insertion.

37. **ἔτλαν** κ.τ.λ.] *I bore grief not to be told.* Schol. ὁ τῷ ἀποθανόντι διαφέρων ἐγὼ ὁ χορός, φησίν, ἔτλαν, but the poet speaks himself as a Theban and friend of the victor's house. **οὐ φατόν**, cp. *Ol.* VI. 37 χόλον οὐ φατόν.

38. **ΓαιάϝοχοςΓ**] Poseidon is the giver of calm; but here the calm is figurative. He gave it through the victory won by Strepsiades at his games.

39. **ἁρμόζων**] Schmid corrected ἁρμόσαις (cp. schol. τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ κεφαλὴν ἁρμόσας); but unnecessarily. The syllable is common; cp. νίφοντα l. 5.

**θρασσέτω**] The metaphor of the calm is continued. *Let not envy of the immortals toss the calm waters.* Compare Aeschylus, *Prometheus* 628 σὰς δ' ὀκνῶ θράξαι φρένας. A scholium μὴ συνθραυέτω points to another reading θραυέτω.—For **φθόνος** cp. Aesch. *Agam.* 904 φθόνος δ' ἀπέστω, Soph. *Phil.* 776 τὸν φθόνον δὲ πρόσκυσον. Also known as Ἀδράστεια (Nemesis).

40. **ὅ τι** κ.τ.λ.] 'Each day pursuing the pleasure thereof'; lit. *pursuing whatever thing of delight comes to me from day to day.* The adjective ἐφάμερος (should we with Mommsen read ἐπάμερον? compare *Pyth.* VIII. 95) has the force of the common phrase ἐφ' ἡμέραν *for the day* (cp. τῆς ἐφ' ἡμέραν βορᾶς Eur. *Electra* 429). Cp. ἐφαμερίαν στάθμαν *Nem.* VI. 6.

41. **ἔπειμι**] *I shall peacefully traverse old age and advance to the fatal hour of life.* Schol. μεθ' ἡσυχίας ἐπί τε τὸ γῆρας καὶ τὸν μεμοιραμένον χρόνον παραγενοίμην. In *Ol.* IX. 58, the only other place where it occurs in Pindar, **ἕκαλος** has the force of λάθρα. Here it has the force of *contented.*—Homer's πρίν μιν καὶ γῆρας ἔπεισιν (A 29) is echoed in **ἔπειμι γῆρας**, but must not mislead as to the construction. γῆρας is conceived as a space traversed and directly governed by ἔπειμι, out of which εἶμι is taken for ἐς αἰῶνα. For **αἰὼν μόρσιμος** as the fatal limit of life cp. *Ol.* IX. 60 μὴ καθέλοι νιν αἰὼν πότμον ἐφάψαις. In *Ol.* II. 10 αἰὼν μόρσιμος is different. Cp. Bacchylides 3 πολιοκρόταφον γῆρας ἱκνεῖσθαι.—For ἔπειμι, D has ἐπεί μιν.

αἰῶνα. θνάσκομεν γὰρ ὁμῶς ἅπαντες,
δαίμων δ' ἄϜισος· τὰ μακρὰ δ' εἴ τις
παπταίνει, βραχὺς ἐξικέσθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἕδραν· ὅ τοι πτερόεις
ἔρριψε Πάγασος

δεσπόταν ἐθέλοντ' ἐς οὐρανοῦ σταθμοὺς ἐπ. γ'. 45
ἐλθεῖν μεθ' ὁμάγυριν Βελλεροφόνταν
Ζηνός· τὸ δὲ πὰρ δίκαν
γλυκὺ πικροτάτα μένει τελευτά.
ἄμμι δ', ὦ χρυσέᾳ κόμᾳ θάλλων, πόρε, Λοξία,
τεαῖσιν ἁμίλλαις 50
εὐανθέα καὶ Πυθόϊ στέφανον.

42. **θνάσκομεν** κ.τ.λ.] Schol. *καθάπαξ γὰρ πάντες ἄνθρωποι ἐνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ ὑποπίπτομεν θανάτῳ, τὰ δὲ τοῦ δαίμονος καὶ τῆς τύχης οὐκέτι ἴσα ἐστὶ καὶ ὅμοια τοῖς πᾶσι.* This note enabled Benedictus to restore *ἄϊσος* l. 43 (*ἅπαξ εἰρημένον*) for *ἄϊστος* which is in the MSS. The digamma of *Ϝίσος* (so in Pindar four times) explains the form, and we may write **ἄϜισος**.—**ὁμῶς** B, *ὅμως* D.—The sense is: different as men's fortunes are, they die alike; let each then have his pleasure.

43, 44. **τὰ μακρά**] *The things which are afar off*, not *ἐφάμερα*. **παπταίνει**, *fixes his eyes on*, used in exactly the same way *Ol.* I. 117 *μηκέτι πάπταινε πόρσιον*, *Pyth.* III. 22 *παπταίνει τὰ πόρσω*.

44. **βραχὺς** κ.τ.λ.] *he is too small to reach the brazen-floored abode of the gods.* Cp. *βραχύ μοι στόμα ἀναγήσασθαι* *Nem.* X. 19.—**χαλκόπεδος** is *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον*.

**ὅ τοι** B, *ὅτι* D.—For *ales Pegasus* and Bellerophon cp. *Ol.* XIII. 84 sqq. (86 *ἵππον πτερόεντ'*). The force of **τοι** is 'according to the well-known story',— an *exemplum grave*.

45. **σταθμούς**] strictly of *farmhouses* (*τὰς κατ' ἀγροὺς ἐπαύλεις*), but Pindar here and elsewhere uses it more generally of an abode; for example, of the last abode of all (*Ol.* X. 92). Here perhaps it hints at the *ἀρχαῖαι φάτναι* which receive Pegasos in *Ol.* XIII. 92, though his master was not to see them. Cp. *Nem.* I. 72.—D has *ἐθέλοντες οὐρανούς*.

46. **ὁμάγυριν Ζηνός**] *the conclave of Zeus.* Compare Υ 142 *θεῶν μεθ' ὁμήγυριν ἄλλων*.

47. **τὸ δὲ** κ.τ.λ.] Schol. *τὸ δὲ ἐξ ἀδικίας ἡδὺ γενόμενον πικρὸν τέλος λαμβάνει.*

49. **χρυσέᾳ**] The first syllable is short, as in *Nem.* V. 7 and eight other places in Pindar. *χρῡσός* is found in *Nem.* VII. 78. The golden hair of Apollo suggests too the *δάφνα χρυσέα* (see *Pyth.* X. 40) which was the prize at his games.—For **πόρε** cp. *Isth.* I. 61.

50. **ἁμίλλαις**] so Bergk: MSS. *ἁμίλλαισιν*. Heyne proposed *σαῖσιν* for **τεαῖσιν**. Perhaps we should read *τ<αῖς σ>αῖσιν* or *ἐν σαῖσιν*.

51. **εὐανθέα**] Responds accurately to **εὐανθέ'** l. 34, as Mezger remarked. **καὶ Πυθόϊ** (Er. Schmid, MSS. *καὶ Πυθοῖ*), *at Pytho as well as at Isthmus.*

# ISTHMIAN VII.

## ODE IN HONOR OF A VICTORY IN THE PANCRATION AT ISTHMUS WON BY CLEANDER OF AEGINA.

### INTRODUCTION.

THE interest, which one would feel in any Greek poem written in the first flush of the victories over the Persian invaders, becomes more curious when directed to a work then composed by the poet of Thebes, whose sympathies were modified, at least in expression, by ties of birth and deep affection binding him to the city which had played such an unvaliant part in the great crisis of Hellas. To mingle in due measure his love of Thebes with his love of Greece, to reconcile patriotism in the narrower sense with patriotism in the wider, was a task demanding from the poet all his matchless dexterity in wielding words and pointing allusions. He had to sympathise with Hellas, without wounding Thebes; to remain a Theban, and yet glory in the Panhellenic cause.

An opportunity for displaying his skill in such delicate handling was soon afforded to Pindar by an invitation coming from a city which had distinguished itself highly in the war. Telesarchus of Aegina asked him to compose a hymn of victory, which at the same time should have another aspect, as an ode in memory of the dead. It should celebrate a victory in the pancration gained by his son Cleander at the Isthmian games, while it should also serve as a monument in verse to his nephew Nicocles who had fallen in the war, he too an Isthmian victor. The conditions of such a task obviously rendered it impossible to pass over in silence the recent events which were filling the minds of men, of all men certainly in Aegina. The Aeginetans had reason to exult in the great deliverance, and Pindar has made *deliverance* the note of this epinician hymn. What may strike one as the most delightful thing about it is the manner in which the artist expresses the feeling of relief, the breathing again, now enjoyed by Hellas after the storm, without ever naming Salamis, Plataea or the 'Medes' His audience could readily understand that Troy is a type of Persia—the Trojan war being historically, as Herodotus knew, a link in the chain of

the Eternal Question,—without any direct word to tell them so. At Aegina generalities were quite as speaking as particular references; for when one talked of μόχθος and πόνος, who could think of any trouble save that through which they had lately laboured? But at Thebes the particular names might well have been more painful than general words, these being less readily appreciated there than in the cities which had shared in the danger and shared also in the glory[1].

In this ode (as elsewhere[2]) the winning of the sea-nymph, the daughter of Nereus, is happily used as a figure to represent the achieving of a victory in the games of the great Sea-god. It follows that Cleander is compared to Peleus; but, whereas in the other hymns where Peleus is introduced the exploits and excellences of that hero are made prominent, here the poet, being chiefly occupied with the circumstance that the marriage is a solution of difficulties, bestows less attention on him. It is related how Zeus and Poseidon desired Thetis, and how Themis revealed the secret of fate in the

[1] Four chief views have been held in regard to the date of this ode. (1) That of Hartung who places it after the battle of Oenophyta may be at once set aside as inappropriate. (2) Boeckh and Dissen held that the hymn was composed for a victory at winter Nemea, in 479—478, just after the battle of Plataea. They think that the grief is too recent to admit of a later date. But, as Mr Fennell says, the ode is clearly an Isthmian, and Unger has proved that winter Nemea are a fiction. (3) Mezger thinks that the tone of the ode is incompatible with the period following the battle of Plataea and the humiliation of Thebes; and he holds that it was written after the battle of Salamis. The stone of Tantalus was removed, but there was still danger ahead. He seems to imply, though he does not distinctly state, that the Isthmian victory was gained in 480, and that the ode was not written till the close of the year. But it sounds as if it immediately followed the victory. (4) Mr Fennell's date seems to me the right one; spring 478. But he thinks that the victory of Cleander was gained not at the Isthmian festival of 478, but at one of three preceding festivals, held in 484, 482, 480, 'Phylakidas being the successful pankratiast on the other two of these three occasions'. The cause of this assumption is his view that *Isth.* III. was written soon after Plataea and that Melissus won his pancration victory in 478. But the evidence for the date of *Isth.* III. is very doubtful; it seems to me that the evidence for Cleander as the pancratiast in 478 is better. A poem, which is a λύτρον καμάτων, surely follows close after the hour of labour; for καμάτων refers primarily to the toil of Cleander, though it may have a secondary application to the death of Nicocles and the troubles of war. But in the main point I agree with Mr Fennell, and it seems to me that, even if Mezger's objections to the date of Boeckh, on the ground that a Theban poet could not have sung ἐκ μεγάλων πενθέων λυθέντες (in 1st plural) immediately after Plataea, be well founded, they do not apply a few months later, in April 478. Hopefulness (l. 16) was then the fitting temper for a Theban whose sympathies were on the right side in the Eternal Cause.—It crosses one's mind that the reiteration παυσάμενοι l. 8, ἔπαυσε l. 13, παύσατε l. 39 may be an allusion to *Paus*anias, as the stayer of troubles. Pindar perhaps wished to be the herald of Theban overtures to Greece.

[2] In the Fifth Nemean; see my *Introduction*.

council of the gods. The son of Thetis was destined to be mightier than his father; and if Zeus or Poseidon begat him, he should wield a weapon more terrible than the thunderbolt or stronger than the trident. Let Thetis wed a mortal and bear a son, mighty indeed but of mortal estate; let her wed the pious Peleus. Such a union will solve the difficulty, and hinder strife among the immortal gods. So Themis persuaded and so the gods decreed.

The application of this narrative (l. 30—50) is made clear by the phraseology. The winning of the Isthmian victory by Cleander has brought joy after grief, has stayed trouble, has delivered from dejection, just as the union of Thetis with Peleus wrought a deliverance from evils and stayed the approach of danger. Observe the emphasis on *loosing* and *staying* in the early verses of the hymn:

1 **Κλεάνδρῳ**—**λύτρον**—*καμάτων.*
6 *ἐκ μεγάλων δὲ πενθέων* **λυθέντες.**
8 **παυσάμενοι** *δ' ἀπράκτων κακῶν.*
13 *καρτερὰν* **ἔπαυσε** *μέριμναν.*

These notes are echoed in the speech of Themis

39 *ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν* **παύσατε.**
48 **λύοι** *κεν χαλινὸν παρθενίας.*

And Pindar regards this legend as a lesson in practical wisdom and a pregnant criticism on life.

12 *ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ δεῖγμα μὲν παροιχομένων*
*καρτερὰν ἔπαυσε μέριμναν· τὸ δὲ πρὸ ποδὸς ἄρειον ἀεὶ...*
*χρῆμα· πανδόλιος γὰρ αἰὼν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι κρέμαται,*
*ἑλίσσων βίου* **πόρον**· *ἰατὰ δ' ἔστι* **βροτοῖς** *σύν γ' ἐλευθερίᾳ*
*καὶ τά.*

The example of accepting the decree of fate and dealing practically with facts was set by Themis[1]; and the healing was wrought by a condescension to the estate of mortality:

34 *εἶπε δ' εὔβουλος ἐν μέσοισι* **Θέμις**
*εἵνεκεν* **πεπρωμένον** *ἦν κ.τ.λ.*
39 **βροτέων** *δὲ λεχέων τυχοῖσα κ.τ.λ.*

[1] Themis is the *arranger;* and if in l. 13 we restore the missing disyllabic infinitive in the sense *arrange*

*τὸ δὲ πρὸ ποδὸς ἄρειον ἀεὶ* **θέμεν,**

it may signal to her name. Other echoes may be noticed which are in harmony with this interpretation of the meaning of the myth. The success of Cleander is described in remarkable words at the end of the ode:

77 *ἥβαν γὰρ οὐκ* **ἄπειρον** *ὑπὸ χειᾷ καλῶν* **δάμασεν**

(see note), suggesting the comparison of his victory with the marriage of Thetis.

47 **δαμαζομέναν** (Bergk's admirable correction).

Again, the young men who sang the comus for Cleander advanced

2 **ἀγλαὸν Τελεσάρχου** *παρὰ πρόθυρον,*

and the marriage of Peleus was celebrated in the presence of the gods who accomplish, and of the bright Poseidon,

30 **ἀγλαὸς** Ποσειδᾶν,
33 *ἀλλ' οὔ σφιν ἄμβροτοι* **τέλεσαν** *κ.τ.λ.*

But this is only a part of the story. Achilles too has his place in the myth, just as Nicocles has a place along with Cleander in the hymn.

At the marriage of Peleus the valour of Achilles, who was to be the issue of that union, was sung, and afterwards, when he lay dead, the maidens of Helicon stood by his pyre and lamented him. He too was a deliverer:

56 Ἑλέναν τ' ἐλύσατο,

even as the dead Nicocles, now deplored by a poet, aided in the deliverance of Greece. Cleander and Nicocles have well maintained the glory of Aegina now, as in olden time the two Aeacids maintained it on the plain of Iolcos and on the plain of Mysia:

44 ὄντ' εὐσεβέστατον φρασὶ Ϝιωλκοῦ τράφει πεδίον.
55 αἵμαξε Τηλέφου μέλανι ῥαίνων φόνῳ πεδίον

(where the two plains are set together by the device of metre). And a certain significance seems to be attached to a plain, as open to the view of men, in contrast with 'holes and corners', in which the deeds of Cleander, as is emphatically stated (l. 77), were *not* performed.

The contrast of the mortal condition of men with the immortal quality of the gods is a note of this hymn[1]; but without making it gloomy. The winners of sea-brides, the recoverers of Helen, must die. And in this connexion Pindar has expressed, in simple and striking words, one of his happiest and deepest criticisms on life,—

βροτέων δὲ λεχέων τυχοῖσα
υἱὸν εἰσιδέτω θανόντ' ἐν πολέμῳ.

[1] Observe: 15 βροτοῖς, 33 ἄμβροτοι, 39 βροτέων, 45 ἄφθιτον, 50 ἀθανάτοισιν, 51 οὐ κατέφθινε, 57 ἐναριμβρότου, 65 ἀθανάτοις, 66 καὶ φθίμενον, 62 οὐδὲ θανόντ

## METRICAL ANALYSIS

(*Rhythm: logaoedic.*)

### Strophe.

⏑ – · – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏓ – ⏑ ϖ · – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ ·
– ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – · – ⏑ – ⏑ ϖ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏓ ·
– ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – · – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ·
↙ – – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – · – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – · – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ·
*v.* 5 – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – · – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ·
– ⏑̄ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏖ · – ⏑ – ⏓
– ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – – ϖ ⏓
– ⏑ – ⏑ ϖ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – · – ⏑ ⏓ ·
ϖ ⏑ – – ϖ ⏑ – ⏑ ϖ ⏑̄
*v.* 10 ↙ – – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓
⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑̄.

M. Schmidt divides this into three unequal groups, of which each falls into symmetrical parts.

A (*vv.* 1—3) is epodic, the scheme being

*a* (*v.* 1) = 6 + 4 = 10,
*a′* (*v.* 2) = 4 + 6 = 10,
*b* (*v.* 3) = 4 + 4 = 8.

B (*vv.* 4—6) is mesodic:

*a* (part of *v.* 4) = 7,
*b* (part of *v.* 4 and *v.* 5) = 3 + 3 + 3 = 9,
*a′* (*v.* 6) = 7.

C (*vv.* 7—11) is tristichic with a short epodikon:

6 · 4 · 5 · 6 · 4 · 5 : 3,
or *a* = 15, *a′* = 15, *b* = 3.

E. Boehmer proposes to make the last three feet of *v.* 6 a separate verse. This will do in every case except in the last strophe, where he has to transpose ἁβρόν and read ἁβρὸν τῷ ἀλίκων τις. His principle is that ⏑⏑ and – cannot alternate in arsis (arsis, that is, in the Greek sense) *within* a verse. For the same reason he regards Ἑλέναν in l. 56 as an *Anfangs-auftakt*, and would therefore read ἀλλά in l. 12 and begin a new line with ἐμέ, which he proposes for ἐμοί.

## ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙ Ζ'.

# ΚΛΕΑΝΔΡΩι ΑΙΓΙΝΗΤΗι

### ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙΩι.

Κλεάνδρῳ τις ἀλικίᾳ τε λύτρον εὔδοξον, ὦ νέοι, καμάτων, στρ. α'.

1. **ἀλικίᾳ τε]** *For Cleander, O young men, and in honour of the youth that is his, come to the bright portal of his father Telesarchus, and awaken a fair comus-song, a thing to deliver from labours, and as the price of an Isthmian victory, and for that he found the quest of victory in the games at Nemea.*—Dissen is probably right in taking ἀλικίᾳ as *robori juvenili ejus;* but his explanation of it as an example of poetical coordination of part and whole (for which he quotes Alcman —Κύπρον ἱμερτὰν λιποῖσα καὶ Πάφον) is evidently not correct. Formally Κλεάνδρῳ ἀλικίᾳ τε is a hendiadys, as Mezger recognizes (comparing Αἴγιναν σφετέραν τε ῥίζαν l. 61 *infra*, and *Nem.* VIII. 46), equivalent to *the young Cleander*. The usual way of expressing this would be Κλεάνδρου ἀλικία, but the hendiadys gives ἀλικία an independent grammatical position, as if she were a person linked with Cleander. It is possible however that the hymn is conceived as a λύτρον for the comrades of Cleander also, and that ἀλικίᾳ is abstract for concrete, like ἥβαν in l. 77 and νεότας in l. 75.

Mr Fennell takes ἀλικίᾳ in the sense of 'youthful companions', *sodales* (referring to l. 72 ἁλίκων τις), an interpretation which Dissen rejected. Of emendations I may mention τι for τε adopted by Bergk, who explains ἀλικίᾳ as *in tempore*.

**λῦτρον]** *A means for deliverance*, as φίλτρον is a means for loving. So in the only other passage in Pindar where it occurs, *Ol.* VII. 77, τόθι λύτρον συμφορᾶς οἰκτρᾶς γλυκὺ Τλαπολέμῳ ἵσταται. Cp. Aeschylus, *Choephoroe*, 48 τί γὰρ λύτρον πεσόντος αἵματος πέδοι; In fact λύτρον is equivalent to the μηχανὴ λυτήριος of Aesch. *Eumen.* 646. In common use λύτρον has the special sense of *ransom.*—Cp. Horace's *laborum dulce lenimen; Pyth.* V. 106

τὸ καλλίνικον λυτήριον δαπανᾶν
μέλος χαρίεν,

*the triumphal song, work of the Graces, that defrayeth the outlay.* Cp. μόχθων ἀμοιβάν *Nem.* V. 48.—For **εὔδοξον** cp. *Isth.* III. A 1, *Pyth.* VI. 17 εὔδοξον ἅρματι νίκαν.—For **καμάτων**, of troubles to be allayed, see *Nem.* I. 70 and VIII. 50. Words signifying trouble and travail are mustered in the first thirteen lines: καμά-

πατρὸς ἀγλαὸν Τελεσάρχου παρὰ πρόθυρον ἰὼν ἀνεγειρέτω
κῶμον, Ἰσθμιάδος τε νίκας ἄποινα, καὶ Νεμέᾳ
ἀέθλων ὅτι κράτος ἐξεῦρε. τῷ καὶ ἐγώ, καίπερ ἀχνύμενος
θυμόν, αἰτέομαι χρυσέαν καλέσαι 5
Μοῖσαν. ἐκ μεγάλων δὲ πενθέων λυθέντες
μήτ' ἐν ὀρφανίᾳ πέσωμεν στεφάνων,
μήτε κάδεα θεράπευε· παυσάμενοι δ' ἀπράκτων κακῶν

των, μεγάλων πενθέων, κάδεα, ἀπράκτων κακῶν, μετὰ πόνον, Ταντάλου λίθον, ἀτόλματον μόχθον, καρτερὰν μέριμναν.

2. **ἀγλαὸν πρόθυρον**] *Bright portal.* The epithet suggests that the vestibule was adorned with fair pillars, and works of art (χαρίεντα ἀγάλματα).—For the singers at the portal see *Nem.* I. 19 ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις.

**ἀνεγειρέτω**] Hermann's restoration of the MSS. reading ἀγειρέτω. One of the scholia supports this correction: ἐγειρέτω τὸν ὕμνον (Abel, p. 479), but another (*ib.* p. 477) has καταγέτω λύτρον τῶν πόνων τὸν εὔδοξον κῶμον. For ἀνεγείρω cp. *Ol.* VIII. 74 and *Isth.* III. B 23. For sense (*suscitare*), *Nem.* X. 21 εὔχορδον ἔγειρε λύραν, and *Ol.* IX. 47 ἔγειρ' ἐπέων οἶμον λιγύν, 'awaken clear-tuned lays'. For the construction τις ἀνεγειρέτω ὦ νέοι (=ἀνεγείρετε, ὦ νέοι) cp. P 227 (Dissen).

3. **ἄποινα**] Simply *price*, in apposition with κῶμον. Cp. above note on *Isth.* III. A 7 εὐκλέων ἔργων ἄποινα.—There seems to be no objection to τε...καὶ connecting the genitive νίκας with the construction ὅτι ἐξεῦρε κράτος, which is equivalent to κράτους ἀέθλων Νεμέᾳ (ἄποινα). Bergk in his 4th ed. punctuates at Νεμέᾳ (which he constructs with νίκας); and in his notes he suggests ὅθι for ὅτι. I see no reason for doubting the received reading.—Νεμέᾳ, *at Nemea*, see *Isth.* VI. 18.

4. **κράτος**] *superiority, victory; Ol.* I. 23 κράτει δὲ προσέμιξε δεσπόταν, *ib.* 78 κράτει δὲ πέλασον.—**ἐξεῦρε** κράτος is an unusual kind of phrase. ἐξευρίσκω occurs in Pindar of poetical invention (ὕμνον *Pyth.* I. 60, νεαρὰ *Nem.* VIII. 20), of Heracles discovering the far west, *Isth.* III. B 56; of finding a brave dog (*reperire*) *frag.* 234, 3. In the present passage the point of ἐξεῦρε is that the victory is conceived as a quest, and it is stronger than Pindar's use of the simple verb (*Ol.* VII. 89 ἄνδρα τε πὺξ ἀρετὰν εὑρόντα, *Pyth.* II. 64 τὰν ἀπείρονα δόξαν εὑρεῖν, *Pyth.* IX. 113 εὗρεν γάμον). For ἐξευρίσκω, *win*, cp. Sophocles, *Philoctetes*, 288 γαστρὶ μὲν τὰ σύμφορα τόξον τόδ' ἐξηύρισκε.

**τῷ**, *therefore;* so below, l. 72.—**ἀχνύμενος**, here and *Pyth.* VII. 16. Pindar is distressed overtly for the death of Nicocles, covertly for the fortunes of Thebes.

5. **αἰτέομαι**] Passive. Cp. Horace's *poscimur.*—**χρυσέαν.** So Nika is golden in *Isth.* II. 26, the Κηληδόνες in *fr.* 53, the children of Themis in *Ol.* XIII. 8. The Muses are χρυσάμπυκες, *Pyth.* III. 89, and their mother is χρυσόπεπλος (above *Isth.* V. 75).—For **καλέσαι**, *invoke*, *Ol.* VI. 58, ἐκάλεσσε Ποσειδᾶνα. For the poet bringing the Muse, see *Nem.* III. 28 Μοῖσαν φέρειν.

6. **πενθέων**] Compare *Nem.* X. 77 τίς δὴ λύσις ἔσσεται πενθέων; **λυθέντες** takes up λύτρον, and πενθέων refers chiefly to the Persian invasion.

7. **ὀρφανίᾳ**] only here in Pindar; *widowhood, lack.* For ἐμπίπτω, cp. *Pyth.* II. 41, *Isth.* III. B 23.

8. **μήτε κ.τ.λ.**] *Nor nurse sorrows.*

**παυσάμενοι κ.τ.λ.**] *ceasing to deal with ills which profit not, we will, even after trouble, sing some sweet jollity.* παυσάμενοι is a key-word in the Ode (see *Intro-*

*γλυκύ τι δαμωσόμεθα καὶ μετὰ πόνον·*
*ἐπειδὴ τὸν ὑπὲρ κεφαλᾶς* 10
*ἄτε Ταντάλου λίθον παρά τις ἔτρεψεν ἄμμι θεὸς*

*ἀτόλματον Ἑλλάδι μόχθον. ἀλλ᾽ ἐμοὶ δεῖγμα μὲν παροιχομένων* στρ. β΄.

*duction*, p. 135). **ἀπράκτων**, only here in Pindar, generally means *unprofitable* or *unsuccessful*. Editors compare *οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις πέλεται κρυεροῖο γόοιο*, but we must remember that *κακῶν* is objective.

9. **δαμωσόμεθα**] Schol. *γλυκύ τι παίξωμεν καὶ εἰς τὸν δῆμον ἀγάγωμεν μετὰ τοὺς πόνους*. This verb occurs here and in Plato, *Theaetetus*, 122 E, *καὶ ταῦτα πῶς μὴ φῶμεν δημούμενον λέγειν τὸν Πρωταγόραν*; That it meant *to sport*, and that *δάμωμα* meant a song, or other manifestation of mirth or jollity, is shewn by the scholium just quoted and by the following glosses: Hesychius, *δαμώματα· παίγνια, δαμώμενος· ἀγαλλόμενος, οἱ δὲ παίζων*, Timaei Lexicon, *δημοῦσθαι· δημοκοπεῖν, παίζειν, εὐφραίνεσθαι*. The word *δάμωμα* occurs in Stesichorus, *fr.* 34:

> *τοιάδε χρὴ Χαρίτων δαμώματα καλλικόμων*
> *ὑμνεῖν Φρύγιον μέλος ἐξευρόνθ᾽ ἁβρῶς ἦρος ἐπερχομένου,*

where the suggestion seems to be a song of joy sung by the members of a *δᾶμος* on the return of spring. These lines of Stesichorus are preserved by the scholiast on Aristophanes, *Peace* 797, where the first verse is quoted.

The force of **καί** is that after trouble something more earnest than a *δάμωμα* might be expected.

10. **ἐπειδὴ** κ.τ.λ.] *Since a god twice turned aside the threat, that like the stone of Tantalus hung over our head, of labour intolerable for Hellas.*

11. **ἄτε**] MSS. *τε*. Schol. on *v.* 12 gives *γε*, which is accepted by Boeckh, Dissen and others contrary to the metre, which requires –. Mommsen proposed *καί*, Mr Fennell reads *τόν*, which is palaeographically good (before *Ταν-τάλου*), but objections may be made to the repetition of the article. Bergk read *ἅτε* (implying ⏑⏑ here for –), which is approved by E. Boehmer and seems very probable.

**Ταντάλου λίθον**] Of the stone which swung over Tantalus, Pindar tells in the First Olympian, l. 57 sqq.:

> *ἅταν ὑπέροπλον, ἄν οἱ πατὴρ* **ὕπερ**
> **κρέμασε καρτερὸν** *αὐτῷ* **λίθον**
> *τὸν αἰεὶ μενοινῶν* **κεφαλᾶς** *βαλεῖν εὐφροσύνας ἀλᾶται.*
> *ἔχει δ᾽ ἀπάλαμον βίον τοῦτον ἐμπεδό***μοχθον**
> *μετὰ τριῶν τέταρτον* **πόνον** *κ.τ.λ.*

Observe the remarkable likeness of the phraseology there and in the passage before us. This indicates that the image of the Tantalean stone was still before Pindar's mind when he wrote *καρτερὰν μέριμναν* (l. 13) and *κρέμαται* (l. 14).

For the proverbial metaphor (whose place was usurped by the 'sword of Damocles' in later times) compare Archilochus *fr.* 53 (quoted in schol. *Ol.* I. 56)

> *μηδ᾽ ὁ Ταντάλου λίθος*
> *τῆσδ᾽ ὑπὲρ νήσου κρεμάσθω,*

and Euripides, *Orest.* 6, 7

> *κορυφῆς ὑπερτέλλοντα δειμαίνων πέτρον*
> *ἀέρι ποτᾶται καὶ τίνει ταύτην δίκην.*

Note the quantity of *ἔ̄τρεψεν*; so *παρά̆τροπος* (*Pyth.* II. 35), *ἀπό̆τροπος*, *ἀπο̆τρέπω*. *παρατρέπω* does not occur elsewhere in Pindar.

12. **ἀτόλματον**] Equivalent to *ἄτλατον*. A scholium thus explains: *παρέτρεψέ τις θεῶν τὸν ἀνυπομόνητον καὶ δεινὸν τῇ Ἑλλάδι πόνον· φησὶ δὲ τὸν Ξέρξου πόλεμον.*

**δεῖγμα**] *But for me, when I take the*

καρτερὰν ἔπαυσε μέριμναν· τὸ δὲ πρὸ ποδὸς ἄρειον ἀεὶ θέμεν

*past as a sample, hard trouble is stayed.* δεῖγμα, *documentum*, example; cp. Euripides, *Suppliants*, 354, Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 988.—The MSS. have δεῖμα. Most editors have sought the corruption elsewhere, and many have followed Pauw in reading παροιχόμενον and interpreting 'the passing away of the terror dissolved my anxiety', a somewhat contorted mode of expression. Oehlschläger and Mezger, reading δειμάτων for δεῖμα μὲν, understand θεός as the subject of ἔπαυσε. Bergk reads ἔμ' οὐ δεῖμα μὲν παροιχόμενον καρτερᾶν ἔπαυσε μεριμνᾶν, but this sentiment is out of keeping with the general tenor of the poem. It is true that the poet says καίπερ ἀχνύμενος, but the stone of Tantalus, the καρτερὰ μέριμνα, has been removed. Mommsen alone seeks the fault in δεῖμα, and bases his proposal χάρμα on the scholium: ἐμοὶ δὲ τῶν φθασάντων κακῶν τόν τε φόβον καὶ τὴν μέριμναν αἱ νῦν τῆς νίκης εὐφροσύναι ἔλυσαν. (Schnitzer's idea that the scholiast read καρτεράν τ' seems probable.)—I venture to think that my restoration of δεῖγμα for δεῖμα is simpler and more satisfactory than any of the suggested changes. The corruption has an exact parallel in the *Agamemnon*, l. 976, where the Codex Farnesianus has δεῖμα for δεῖγμα (δεῖγμα probably being the true reading, see Verrall, *ad loc.*). The recent deliverance of Greece is a proof or evidence of future safety, a sample of what is to come: the δεῖγμα consists in the παροιχόμενα. After the palpable intervention of τις θεός Pindar is no longer anxious. For τὰ παροιχόμενα, *the past*, cp. Herodotus VII. 120; *ib.* I. 209 ἡ παροιχομένη νύξ. See also *Nem.* VI. 29.

13. **ἔπαυσε**] The scholiast's ἔλυσαν combined with *frag.* 248: ἀντιταττόμενον τῷ Λυσίῳ θεῷ λύοντι τὸ τῶν δυσφόρων σχοινίον μεριμνῶν κατὰ Πίνδαρον (Plut., *de adul. et amic.* c. 27) almost induces us to believe that Pindar wrote not ΕΠΑΥϹΕ but ΕΛΥϹΕ. There the Λύσιος θεός is Dionysus. Cp. also Sappho, I. 25 χαλεπᾶν δὲ λῦσον ἐκ μεριμνᾶν, and a fragment of Thales (*P. L. G.* III. p. 200) λύσεις γὰρ ἀνδρῶν κωτίλων γλώσσας ἀπεραντολόγους where Bergk reads παύσεις. Both παύω and λύω are key-words in this Ode, παύω occurring three times (here, l. 8 and l. 39); and only twice in the rest of Pindar (*Nem.* III. 39 and VI. 20; but ἀναπαύομαι *Nem.* VI. 11 and ἀνάπαυσις *Nem.* VII. 52).

**τὸ δὲ πρὸ ποδός**] what is present or instant, opposed to what is not so (here, to what is past). Compare Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex*, 130

ἡ ποικιλῳδὸς Σφὶγξ τὸ πρὸς ποσὶ σκοπεῖν
μεθέντας ἡμᾶς τἀφανῆ προσήγετο,

where τὸ πρὸς ποσί is 'the *instant, pressing* trouble opp. to τὰ ἀφανῆ, obscure questions of no present or practical interest' (Jebb). Cp. *Antigone* 1327 τὰν ποσὶν κακά.

**ἄρειον** κ.τ.λ.] MSS. ἄρειον ἀεὶ | χρῆμα, with defective metre. Two syllables, scanning ⏑ –, are wanted after or before ἀεί. Hermann read ἀεὶ τέλει, but Dissen concluded from the scholia that an infinitive meaning *regard* had fallen out, and read ἀεὶ σκοπεῖν. Bergk, on the same lines, prints ὁρᾶν ἀεί. The scholia in question are as follows (Abel, p. 484): πᾶν δὲ προσήκει τὸ παρὰ πόδας πρᾶγμα σκοπεῖν καὶ εὖ διατιθέναι. § ἀεὶ δὲ βέλτιόν ἐστι πᾶν τὸ παρὰ πόδας πρᾶγμα προσβλέπειν.—It is quite possible that the lost word, which was not lost for Didymus, meant *see;* and if we write ἄρειον ἰδεῖν ἀεί in uncials, we see that ἰδεῖν might have disappeared:

ΑΡΕΙΟΝΙΔΕΙΝΑΕΙ.

I venture to think however that Pindar wrote ἀεὶ θέμεν (cp. schol. εὖ διατιθέναι); see above *Introduction*, p. 135.—The scholiasts remark that this was a favourite thought of Pindar: ὅτι τῶν παρόντων καὶ ἐνεστηκότων ἀεί φησιν ὁ Πίνδαρος δεῖν ἀντέ-

χρῆμα. πανδόλιος γὰρ αἰὼν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι κρέμαται,
ἑλίσσων βίου πόρον· ἰατὰ δ' ἔστι βροτοῖς σύν γ' ἐλευθερίᾳ 15
καὶ τά. χρὴ δ' ἀγαθὰν ἐλπίδ' ἀνδρὶ μέλειν·
χρὴ δ' ἐν ἑπταπύλοισι Θήβαις τραφέντα
Αἰγίνᾳ Χαρίτων ἄωτον προνέμειν,

χεσθαι καὶ μὴ ὀρέγεσθαι τῶν μελλόντων. Cp. *Ol.* I. 99 τὸ δ' αἰεὶ παράμερον ἐσλὸν ὕπατον ἔρχεται παντὶ βροτῶν, and *Pyth.* X. 62

τῶν δ' ἕκαστος ὀρούει
τυχών κεν ἁρπαλέαν σχέθοι φροντίδα
τὰν πὰρ ποδός·
τὰ δ' εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ἀτέκμαρτον προνοῆσαι.

A good comment on ἰδεῖν, if it be preferred, would be *Ol.* XII. 9, τῶν δὲ μελλόντων τετύφλωνται φραδαί (here expressed by πανδόλιος αἰών).

**ἄρειον**] Understand ἐστιν. Hartung writes χρῆμά 'στιν in the following line for χρῆμα πᾶν.—**αἰεί**, *from moment to moment;* cp. Horace's *dona praesentis cape laetus horae.*

14. **πανδόλιος**] I follow Bergk in this correction of the MSS. χρῆμα πᾶν· δόλιος. The expression τὸ πρὸ ποδὸς χρῆμα does not need πᾶν, which is awkward and weak, as Hartung perceived. πανδόλιος is an epithet thoroughly characteristic of the Pindaric mint; cp. παμποίκιλος, παμφάρμακος, πάμπρωτος, παμπόρφυρος.

**αἰὼν ἐπικρέμαται**] The figure is a wind hanging about the course of mariners, but ἐπικρέμαται is chosen with reference to the preceding metaphor of the Tantalean stone. For the connexion of αἰών with ἄημι in Pindar's mind see above, note on *Isth.* III. A 18. For ἑλίσσω compare *Ol.* X. 8 ψᾶφον ἑλισσομέναν ὀπᾷ κῦμα κατακλύσσει ῥέον. The phrase τὸ πρὸ ποδός lends itself to the metaphor (πούς, *a sheet*), compare *Nem.* VI. 55 τὸ δὲ πὰρ ποδὶ ναὸς ἑλισσόμενον αἰεὶ κυμάτων.

15. **βίου πόρον**] The force of πόρος here is *fated* course or crossing, with reference to the meaning of πεπρωμένος, *fated;* see below l. 35 πεπρωμένον ἦν, and above *Introduction*, p. 135.—For βίου the MSS. have βιότου. The error may have arisen from βροτοῦ in some explanatory note.—Schol. ὁ γὰρ δὴ τῆς ζωῆς χρόνος ἐνήρτηται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὸν τοῦ βίου πόρον κυλίων καὶ προϊών.

**σύν γ' ἐλευθερίᾳ**] *at least, if they have Freedom; if Freedom minister unto them.* Ἐλευθερία is conceived here as a looser or deliverer, and her name connected with λύειν. This etymology was perhaps suggested by the aorist passive form ἐλύθην, whose participle λυθέντες occurred in l. 6 above. ἐλευθερία is seldom used by Pindar; we have it in *Pyth.* I. 61, of the constitution of Aetna (θεοδμάτῳ σὺν ἐλευθερίᾳ), and in *frag.* 77, of Athens.

16. **καὶ τά**] *Even that case;* namely, the lot implied in the foregoing words, πανδόλιος γὰρ αἰών κ.τ.λ., the changes and chances of deceptive time, regarded in this clause as a disease.

**χρὴ δ'**] *It is meet that a man should set store by brave hope; yea, meet is it that one bred in seven-gated Thebes should offer above all to Aegina choice firstfruits of the Graces, because there were born to her father twin daughters, the youngest of the Asopides, and they found favour with Zeus the king.*

17. **τραφέντα**] *born and bred.*

18. **Χαρίτων ἄωτον προνέμειν**] The scholia explain τὸν ὕμνον τὸν ὄντα Χαρίτων ἀπάνθισμα διδόναι, or again τὸ ἄνθος τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν Χαρίτων προσνέμειν. The phrase seems to mean *to give fair firstfruits from the garden of the Graces* (Χαρίτων κᾶπος *Ol.* IX. 27). For this suggestion of ἄωτος compare the scholia on *Ol.* III. 4 ὕμνον, ἵππων ἄωτον (schol. ἀπάνθισμα τῶν καρπῶν) and *Ol.* VIII. 75 χειρῶν ἄωτον (schol.

πατρὸς οὕνεκα δίδυμαι γένοντο θύγατρες Ἀσωπίδων
ὁπλόταται, Ζηνί τε Ϝάδον βασιλέϊ. 20
ὃ τὰν μὲν παρὰ καλλιρόῳ
Δίρκᾳ φιλαρμάτου πόλιος ᾤκισσεν ἀγεμόνα·

σὲ δ' ἐς νᾶσον Οἰνοπίαν ἐνεγκὼν κοιμᾶτο, δῖον ἔνθα τέκες στρ. γ'.
Αἰακὸν βαρυσφαράγῳ πατρὶ κεδνότατον ἐπιχθονίων· ὃ καὶ
δαιμόνεσσι δίκας ἐπείραινε· τοῦ μὲν ἀντίθεοι 25

καρπὸν ὃν κ.τ.λ.).—**προνέμειν**, *prae aliis tribuere* (Dissen and Rumpel), a rare word.

19. **πατρός**] Asopus, the river of Boeotia. Ἀσωπίδων from Ἀσωπίς, feminine patronymic.

20. **ὁπλόταται**] Theba and Aegina were younger than Metopa.—For quantity of the first syllable (ὅ) see above *Isth.* v. 6. The MSS. have ὁπλότατα.

**τε Ϝάδον βασιλέϊ**] So Schmid for θ' ἅδον βασιλῆι, a mistake which naturally arose from the omission of the digamma.

21. **ὃ κ.τ.λ.**] *Who set Theba to dwell by the banks of the fair stream of Dirca, as sovran of a chariot-loving city.*—**ὅ**, masc. relative as below l. 24 (properly of course demonstrative).—**καλλίροος**, a Homeric epithet; elsewhere in Pindar only *Ol.* vi. 83.

22. **φιλαρμάτου**] This epithet is also applied to Thebes by Euripides, who probably took it from Pindar, in *Hercules Furens*, 467.—**ᾤκισσεν**, in Herodotus, not in Homer, and only here in Pindar. Mr Fennell remarks that ἁγεμών is 'only here used in the feminine gender'. We might bring this out by using a strange form like *leaderess*.

23. **σὲ δ'**] *Thee, Aegina* (σέ depending on ἐνεγκών). Schol. (p. 492) σὲ δέ, ὦ Αἴγινα, φησίν, εἰς τὴν Οἰνοπίαν διακομίσας νῆσον συνεκοιμήθη...εὐφήμως οὖν εἶπε τὸ κοιμᾶτο ὡς καὶ Ὅμηρος· τὼ δ' ἐς δέμνια βάντε κατέδραθον (θ 296).—The island of Aegina was called Oenopia as well as Oenona, *Vineland*. (Both names were connected with obscure legendary persons: schol. ἄμεινον δὲ ἀπὸ Οἴνοπος ἥρωός τινος λέγεσθαι αὐτήν. Tzetzes on Lycophron, l. 175, Οἰνώνη ἐλέγετο ἀπὸ Οἰνώνης τῆς Βουδίωνος θυγατρός, καθά φησι Πυθαίνετος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Αἰγινητῶν.)

**ἐνεγκών**] Bergk reads φέρων ἐκοιμᾶτο for the sake of the metre, comparing *Pyth.* III. 45, καί ῥά νιν Μάγνητι φέρων πόρε Κενταύρῳ διδάξαι. Hermann read ἔνεγκε κοιμᾷ τε, Kayser ἐνεγκὼν κοίμασε.—**κοιμᾶτο** = συνεκοιμᾶτο. *He bare thee to the isle of Oenopia and rested by thy side.* The imperfect tense often takes the place of the aorist in epic narration.—**δῖον**, as son of Zeus.

24. **βαρυσφαράγῳ**] *Deep-rumbling* (of the thunder of Zeus); ἅπαξ εἰρημένον. σφαραγίζω is found in Hesiod, *Theogony* 706 σὺν δ' ἄνεμοι ἔνοσίν τε κονίην τ' ἐσφαράγιζον. σφαραγεῖσθαι is used in the Odyssey of the eye of the Cyclops hissing beneath the burning stake of Odysseus, ι 390.

**κεδνότατον**] See note on *Isth.* I. 5.—Compare *Nem.* VIII. 8, where after a like introduction (Διὸς Αἰγίνας τε λέκτρον κ.τ.λ.) Aeacus is called χειρὶ καὶ βουλαῖς ἄριστος, a phrase which fitly explains κεδνότατον.—For ὃ see above l. 21.

25. **δίκας ἐπείραινε**] *lites componebat, conficiebat;* a phrase which does not occur elsewhere. Old MSS. ἐπέραινε. πειραίνω for περαίνω is Homeric.—This is the only passage in which there is mention of Aeacus as an arbitrator among deities.

**ἀντίθεοι**] Pindar applies this Homeric epithet to Peleus, Cadmus, the children

*ἀρίστευον υἱέες υἱέων τ' ἀρηΐφιλοι παῖδες ἀνορέᾳ*
*χάλκεον στονόεντ' ἀμφέπειν ὅμαδον·*
*σώφρονές τ' ἐγένοντο πινυτοί τε θυμόν.*
*ταῦτα καὶ μακάρων ἐμέμναντ' ἀγοραί,*
*Ζεὺς ὅτ' ἀμφὶ Θέτιος ἀγλαός τ' ἔρισας, Ποσειδᾶν, γάμῳ,* 30
*ἄλοχον εὐειδέ' ἐθέλων ἑκάτερος*
*ἑὰν ἔμμεν· ἔρως γὰρ ἔχεν.*
*ἀλλ' οὔ σφιν ἄμβροτοι τέλεσαν εὐνὰν θεῶν πραπίδες,*

*ἐπεὶ θεσφάτων ἤκουσαν. εἶπε δ' εὔβουλος ἐν μέσοισι Θέμις,* στρ. δ'.

of Leto, the Argonauts; he never uses *ἰσόθεος*.

26. **ἀρηΐφιλοι**] Only here in Pindar.—**ἀνορέᾳ** (see *Isth.* III. B 11) defines *ἀρίστευον*, *were best in manlihood, even for handling the rumbling din of brazen war.*

27. **στονόεντα**] A Homeric adjective (*βέλεα στονόεντα* are *whizzing arrows*), only here in Pindar. *χάλκεον* renders the reference to warfare unequivocal. In Homer **ὅμαδος** means (1) the noisy company of fighters, and (2) the noise or din of many voices. Here it means *battle*, with stress on the noise, further defined by *στονόεντα*. Cp. Simon. 143 *στονόεντα κατὰ κλόνον*.—**ἀμφέπειν**, *manage, handle, order.* Cp. *Pyth.* IV. 268 *μόχθον ἀμφέπῃ*, *discharge a laborious service.* In *Nem.* VII. 91, *ἀταλὸν ἀμφέπων θυμόν* means *ordering his soul so as to be gentle.* If we wished to translate into Greek 'so to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom', we might introduce *θυμὸν ἀμφέπειν φρόνιμον*.

28. **σώφρονες**] *σώφρων* does not occur in Pindar except here and *Pyth.* III. 63 of Chiron. **πινυτός** only here in Pindar.

29. **ταῦτα** κ.τ.λ.] *These things were remembered also in the council-chambers of heaven, when for the marriage of Thetis, Zeus strove, and thou O Poseidon, each wishing that her beauty should be his to wed.* **ταῦτα**, the origin and excellences of the Aeacids.—**μέμναντο**: this verb is not found elsewhere with an accusative in Pindar.

30. **ἀμφὶ Θέτιος—γάμῳ**] For *ἀμφί* with dative in this sense cp. *Ol.* IX. 90 *μένεν ἀγῶνα πρεσβυτέρων ἀμφ' ἀργυρίδεσσιν*, *Pyth.* IX. 120 and *Isth.* IV. 55.—**ἔρισας** was altered by Heyne to *ἔρισαν*, which most editors adopt. But Mommsen pointed out that *Ποσειδᾶν* is vocative. The direct address to Poseidon is graceful in an Isthmian Ode.—For **ἀγλαός** of the sea-god cp. *ἀγλαόκρανος* of Thetis *Nem.* III. 56, and *ἀγλαοτρίαινα* of Poseidon *Ol.* I. 41.

31. **εὐειδέα**] only here in Pindar.—For **θέλων** Boeckh *ἐθέλων*, holding that Pindar always used this form. *Θέτιν* is the subject of **ἔμμεν**, and **ἄλοχον εὐειδέα** (defined emphatically by **ἑάν**, *a wife for himself*) the predicate.

32. **ἔχεν**] Schmid's emendation of MSS. *ἔσχεν*. The two Triclinian MSS. known as *ε'* and *ζ'* read *ἕλεν*. The imperfect is demanded both by sense and by metre; cp. schol. *ἀμφοτέρους κατεῖχεν*.

33. **ἀλλ' οὔ σφιν** κ.τ.λ.] *But the deathless wisdom of the gods brought not their marriage to accomplishment, when they heard the import of the oracles.*—*οὔ σφιν* (B *ἄσφι*) more generally than *οὐδ' ἑτέρῳ* (neither Zeus nor Poseidon), which we might expect.—**ἄμβροτοι** occurs only three times in Pindar; here, *Nem.* X. 7 (of Diomede) and *frag.* 75 (*χθόνα*).

34. **ἤκουσαν**] So MSS. (*ε' ζ' ἐπακου-*

εν πεπρωμένον ἦν φέρτερον γόνον Ϝάνακτα πατρὸς τεκεῖν 35
ίαν θεόν, ὅς κεραυνοῦ τε κρέσσον ἄλλο βέλος
ει χερὶ τριόδοντός τ' ἀμαιμακέτου, Δὶ δαμαζομέναν
ὸς παρ' ἀδελφεοῖσιν. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν
ατε· βροτέων δὲ λεχέων τυχοῖσα
εἰσιδέτω θανόντ' ἐν πολέμῳ, 40
' Ἄρει χέρας ἐναλίγκιον στεροπαῖσί τ' ἀκμὰν ποδῶν.

Hermann ὅπ' ἄκουσαν, Boeckh ν, ἔειπεν, Bergk ἐσυνῆκαν. Mr Fen-adopts ἐπάκουσαν.—The scholiast rets (p. 497) ἐπειδὴ τῶν μεμοιρα- κατήκουσαν. ἐπάκουσαν does not elsewhere in Pindar, but it is ear why it should have been cor- here, if it stood in the original I prefer to keep the reading of B ), and suppose that here – corre- s to ⏑ ⏑.

ουλος] Compare *Ol.* XIII. 8 παῖδες ου Θέμιτος, and *frag.* 30 εὔβουλον Aesch. *Prom.* 18 ὀρθοβούλου.

**οὕνεκεν**] Donaldson for MSS. εἵ- –**φέρτερον γόνον**, Achilles is called φέρτατον in *Nem.* III. 57. As the ands there is an irregularity in the . The second syllable of γόνον, before Ϝάνακτα, corresponds to ⏑́ ⏑ e answering lines of the other ies. There is no insuperable ob- to this arrangement, but editors been at pains to compass uniformity. h γόνον οἱ (but we expect Ϝοι), r γόνον ἔτ', and Bergk κε γόνον. last named scholar also proposes ἄν which would be palaeographi- preferable. Mommsen resorts to ositions. If any change be thought ary, I should rather read φέρτερόν ΟΝΟΝ, a son who will certainly be than his father, whether god or –**ἄνακτα** is happy, as it applies to a θεός or to a βροτός.

**θεόν**] *goddess*, *Nem.* V. 13. ποντίαν Thetis, is the subject of τεκεῖν, and ct is stated as a sure consequence e condition expressed by δαμαζο-μέναν (l. 37) = ἂν δαμάζηται.

37. **διώξει χερί**] *shall wield*, agitabit. Cp. φόρμιγγα διώκων, *Nem.* V. 24.— **ἀμαιμακέτου**, here of Poseidon's trident, as *Pyth.* I. 14 of his realm (πόντον). In *Pyth.* IV. 208 κινηθμὸν πετρᾶν ἀμαιμάκετον, in *Pyth.* III. 33 of Artemis μένει θύοισαν ἀμαιμακέτῳ, *resistless*. Pindar does not use τρίαινα, though he has εὐτρίαινα etc. as titles of Poseidon.

**Δὶ δαμαζομέναν**] Bergk's emendation of MSS. διὶ μισγομέναν, due to an 'interpretamentum', just as in *Pyth.* XI. 24 ἢ ἑτέρῳ λέχεϊ δαμαζομέναν the scholiast explains ἢ ἑτέρῳ αὐτὴν ἀνδρὶ μισγομένην. This correction is also supported, with regard to παρ' ἀδελφεοῖσι in the following line, by P 421 εἰ καὶ μοῖρα παρ' ἀνέρι τῷδε δαμῆναι πάντας ὁμῶς. Finally δαμαζομέναν is confirmed by a signal, which I have pointed out in the *Introduction*, p. 135.—Schmid and many editors accepted Ζηνὶ from ε' ζ'. Mr Fennell reads Διί γε. For Δί cp. *Nem.* I. 72.

38. **ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν** κ.τ.λ.] *Nay, give up these thoughts* (of a marriage between Thetis and an immortal); *but wedded to a mortal let her look upon a son slain in war, one like unto Ares in might of hands, and to lightning flashes in the speed and sheen of his feet.*—For **παύσατε** see *Introduction*, p. 135.—**τυχοῖσα**, the Aeolic form, restored by Heyne for MSS. τυχοῦσα.

41. **ἀνδρ' Ἄρει χέρας**] MSS. Ἀρεϊ χεῖρας ἐναλίγκιον (ε' ζ' χέρας). To restore the metre which requires

–⏑, –⏑, ⏑⏑⏑, –⏑, –

most editors adopt the transposition of

*τὸ μὲν ἐμόν, Πηλέϊ γέρας θεόμορον*
*ὀπάσσαι γάμον Αἰακίδᾳ,*
*ὄντ' εὐσεβέστατον φρασὶ, Ϝιωλκοῦ τράφει πεδίον·*

*στρ. ε'.*

*ἰόντων δ' ἐς ἄφθιτον ἄντρον εὐθὺ Χείρωνος αὐτίκ' ἀγγελίαι·* 45

Boeckh χεῖρας Ἄρεΐ τ' ἐναλίγκιον, but as no cause is assigned for such an error, and as the insertion of τ' is also involved in this restoration, I regard it as extremely unlikely. Bergk was not satisfied, and conjectured ὃς Ἄρει χέρας, but the possessive adjective is not wanted. I venture to read **ἄνδρ'**, which is distinctly to the point. The son of Peleus and Thetis will be an ἀνήρ, not a θεός, as would be the son of Zeus or Poseidon and Thetis. The word is placed emphatically at the beginning of the verse. Its omission can be easily accounted for. The second two letters of ἄνδρ' were omitted owing to their likeness, in uncials, to the first two letters of Ἄρει (ΑΝΔΡΑΡΕΙ) and the remnant ἄν was discarded as unmeaning.—For quantity of Ἄρει see note on *Nem.* X. 84.

For **ἀκμάν** see above *Isth.* III. B 51.

42, 43. **τὸ μὲν ἐμόν** κ.τ.λ.] *My counsel is to give the divine marriage as a high guerdon to Peleus, son of Aeacus.* Cp. *Nem.* XI. 24.

**γέρας θεόμορον** κ.τ.λ.] MSS. Πηλεῖ θεόμοιρον ὀπάσαι γάμον Αἰακίδᾳ γέρας. It is clear that θεόμορον (cp. *Ol.* III. 10, *Pyth.* V. 5) is the last word of l. 42 and Αἰακίδᾳ the last word of l. 43. All editors follow Hermann in transposing γάμου to l. 42 and inserting γέρας in its place after ὀπάσσαι; thus

Πηλεῖ γάμου θεόμορον
ὀπάσσαι γέρας Αἰακίδᾳ.

But why should both γάμου and γέρας have thus been pushed out of their places? The reading which I have given in the text (where **γάμον** is in apposition to γέρας and is defined by θεόμορον) assumes that γάμου γέρας was a marginal explanation, which may have led to the corruption of γάμον and the insertion of γέρας after Αἰακίδᾳ with its consequent omission after Πηλέϊ.—**ὀπάσσαι.** Pindar uses both forms in σσα and forms in σα of this verb: ὤπασας, ὤπασε, ὄπασσεν, ὤπασαν, ὀπάσαις.

44. **φρασί**] φρασίν is Bergk's excellent correction (adopted by Mezger) of φασίν which suits neither metre nor sense. This change necessitates a further change of τραφεῖν to some finite part of the verb, and this need cause no difficulty, for, when φρασίν was falsely read φασίν, the infinitive τραφεῖν was inevitable. Bergk reads τράφεν, but see below. Bothe conjectured φάτις which Christ accepts.—**Ϝιωλκοῦ**, MSS. Ἰαωλκοῦ, vulg. φασίν Ἰωλκοῦ, Bergk φρασίν Ἰωλκοῦ, but we may presume that Pindar preferred the digamma to the final ν. For the conquest of Iolcus by Peleus see *Nem.* III. 34 ὃς καὶ Ϝιωλκὸν εἷλε. Bergk's reading τράφεν would imply that Peleus had been bred, if not born and bred, in the plain of Iolcus, which was only a recent conquest of the hero. I therefore read **τράφει** = alit, *supports, nourishes*, see *Isth.* I. 48. Peleus lived in Iolcus, when Thetis was offered to him. Donaldson and Mr Fennell give φάτις and τράφειν, but the reading in the text involves less change.

45. **ἰόντων** κ.τ.λ.] *Let the tidings speed anon, straight to Chiron to his immortal cave.* Chiron's cave is σεμνὸν in *Pyth.* IX. 30, and here **ἄφθιτον**, as the abode of a seer. Cp. ἀθανάτου στόματος (*Pyth.* IV. 10) of the mouth of Medea.—**εὐθύ**, Herm[illegible] emendation [illegible] MSS. εὐθύς (whi[illegible]eeded w[illegible] confirmed [illegible]re (h[illegible] l. 23). X[illegible]ds o[illegible]

μηδὲ Νηρέος θυγάτηρ νεικέων πέταλα δὶς ἐγγυαλιζέτω
ἄμμιν· ἐν διχομηνίδεσσιν δὲ Fεσπέραις ἐρατὸν
λύοι κεν χαλινὸν ὑφ' ἥρωι παρθενίας. ὣς φάτο Κρονίδαις
ἐννέποισα θεά· τοὶ δ' ἐπὶ γλεφάροις
νεῦσαν ἀθανάτοισιν· ἐπέων δὲ καρπὸς 50
οὐ κατέφθινε. φαντὶ γὰρ ξύν' ἀλέγειν

46. **μηδὲ** κ.τ.λ.] *And let not the daughter of Nereus twice lay leaves of strife in the hollows of our hands.*—**πέταλα νεικέων**, *a strife to be decided by leaves*, alludes to voting on olive leaves as in *petalismos* at Syracuse or the ἐκφυλλοφορία at Athens. Cp. above ἀγοραί, l. 29. The form of expression suggests that the metaphor is intended to be significant. A scholiast quotes κλάδον Ἐνυαλίου from Ibycus (*fr.* 29), cp. Homeric ὄζον Ἄρηος.—**ἐγγυαλίζειν** does not occur elsewhere in Pindar. It properly means to place in the hand hollowed to receive a gift.

47. **διχομηνίδεσσιν**] There are three forms, διχόμηνος, διχόμην, and διχόμηνις, meaning *month-dividing*, that is *at-the-fullmoon*. διχόμηνος is the prose form, occurring in Plutarch; διχόμην is used by Aratus. In *Ol.* III. 19 we have διχόμηνις χρυσάρματος Μήνα. For the good-luck of marriage at the full-moon see Euripides, *Iphigeneia at Aulis* 717, where Agamemnon fixes the union of Achilles and Iphigeneia, ὅταν σελήνης εὐτυχὴς ἔλθῃ κύκλος.—**Fεσπέραις**, not digammated elsewhere in Pindar; for the plural cp. νύκτες. With ἐρατόν in this connexion compare *Pyth.* IX. 12 καί σφιν ἐπὶ γλυκεραῖς εὐναῖς ἐρατὰν βάλεν αἰδῶ.

48. **χαλινὸν παρθενίας**] the maiden's girdle, ζώνη. Cp. λῦσε παρθενίην ζώνην, λ 245, where the subject of λῦσε is the man, the middle λύεσθαι being properly used of the maiden, here λύοι exceptionally (cp. Eur. *Alc.* 177). Pindar has χαλινός metaphorically of an anchor, θοᾶς Ἀργοῦς χαλινόν *Pyth.* IV. 25. Cp. Aesch. *P.V.* 562.—The [illegible]tion implied by λύοι κεν is [illegible]lity [illegible]ood; *if you follow my counsel.* Translate: *But she might well undo the dear bridle that binds her maidenhead in the hero's embrace on a midmonth eventide.*

**Κρονίδαις**] Literally *the sons of Cronus*, Zeus and Poseidon, who are specially interested; not generally of the gods.

49. **τοὶ δ' ἐπὶ** κ.τ.λ.] *But they nodded assent with immortal eyelids; and the fruit of her speech withered not to death.* **ἐπι-νεῦσαν** (tmesis), only here in Pindar, who twice uses νεύω in the sense of nodding yea. ἐπινεύειν **γλεφάροις** is a variation on the Homeric ἐπινεύειν ὀφρύσι.

50. **καρπός**] Editors quote for the metaphor Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, 684 χρησμοὺς—μηδ' ἀκαρπώτους κτίσαι, *Sept. c. Thebas*, 614 εἰ καρπὸς ἔσται θεσφάτοισι Λοξίου. Here perhaps the καρπὸς ἐπέων (of the counsel of Themis) is opposed to the πέταλα νεικέων (of the quarrel which Themis allayed).

51. **κατέφθινε**, not elsewhere in Pindar. **ξύν' ἀλέγειν**] Hermann's emendation of συναλέγειν. It seems best to take **ξυνὰ καὶ γάμον** as a sort of hendiadys (so Mezger), ξυνά being the cognate and γάμον the ordinary accusative after ἀλέγειν. **ἄνακτα** is Zeus, and **ξυνά** means the communion of Zeus and Themis. For ξυνός of two associates cp. *Isth.* V. 36, and *Pyth.* IX. 13 ξυνὸν γάμον.—For ἄνακτα (to which B has the gloss τὸν Δία) Christ reads ἄνακτε (Zeus and Poseidon) after two Triclinian MSS., Kayser ἄνακτι (Peleus), and Bergk ἄνακτας (Cronidae; 'dicunt ipsos deos Thetidis nuptias carminibus celebravisse'). I do not like to change the text, as I

τὸ μὲν ἐμόν, Πηλέϊ γέρας θεόμορον
ὀπάσσαι γάμον Αἰακίδᾳ,
ὄντ' εὐσεβέστατον φρασί, Ϝιωλκοῦ τράφει πεδίον·

στρ. ε΄.

ἰόντων δ' ἐς ἄφθιτον ἄντρον εὐθὺ Χείρωνος αὐτίκ' ἀγγελίαι· 45

Boeckh χεῖρας Ἄρεϊ τ' ἐναλίγκιον, but as no cause is assigned for such an error, and as the insertion of τ' is also involved in this restoration, I regard it as extremely unlikely. Bergk was not satisfied, and conjectured ὃς Ἄρει χέρας, but the possessive adjective is not wanted. I venture to read **ἄνδρ'**, which is distinctly to the point. The son of Peleus and Thetis will be an ἀνήρ, not a θεός, as would be the son of Zeus or Poseidon and Thetis. The word is placed emphatically at the beginning of the verse. Its omission can be easily accounted for. The second two letters of ἄνδρ' were omitted owing to their likeness, in uncials, to the first two letters of Ἄρει (ΑΝΔΡΑΡΕΙ) and the remnant ἄν was discarded as unmeaning.—For quantity of Ἄρει see note on *Nem.* X. 84.

For **ἀκμάν** see above *Isth.* III. B 51.

42, 43. **τὸ μὲν ἐμόν** κ.τ.λ.] *My counsel is to give the divine marriage as a high guerdon to Peleus, son of Aeacus.* Cp. *Nem.* XI. 24.

**γέρας θεόμορον** κ.τ.λ.] MSS. Πηλεῖ θεάμοιρον ὀπάσαι γάμον Αἰακίδᾳ γέρας. It is clear that θεόμορον (cp. *Ol.* III. 10, *Pyth.* V. 5) is the last word of l. 42 and Αἰακίδᾳ the last word of l. 43. All editors follow Hermann in transposing γάμου to l. 42 and inserting γέρας in its place after ὀπάσσαι; thus

Πηλεῖ γάμου θεόμορον
ὀπάσσαι γέρας Αἰακίδᾳ.

But why should both γάμου and γέρας have thus been pushed out of their places? The reading which I have given in the text (where **γάμον** is in apposition to γέρας and is defined by θεόμορον) assumes that γάμου γέρας was a marginal explanation, which may have led to the corruption of γάμον and the insertion of γέρας after Αἰακίδᾳ with its consequent omission after Πηλέϊ.—**ὀπάσσαι.** Pindar uses both forms in σσα and forms in σα of this verb: ὤπασας, ὤπασε, ὄπασσεν, ὤπασαν, ὀπάσαις.

44. **φρασί**] φρασίν is Bergk's excellent correction (adopted by Mezger) of φασίν which suits neither metre nor sense. This change necessitates a further change of τραφεῖν to some finite part of the verb, and this need cause no difficulty, for, when φρασίν was falsely read φασίν, the infinitive τραφεῖν was inevitable. Bergk reads τράφεν, but see below. Bothe conjectured φάτις which Christ accepts.—**Ϝιωλκοῦ**, MSS. Ἰαωλκοῦ, vulg. φασὶν Ἰωλκοῦ, Bergk φρασὶν Ἰωλκοῦ, but we may presume that Pindar preferred the digamma to the final ν. For the conquest of Iolcus by Peleus see *Nem.* III. 34 ὃς καὶ Ϝιωλκὸν εἷλε. Bergk's reading τράφεν would imply that Peleus had been bred, if not born and bred, in the plain of Iolcus, which was only a recent conquest of the hero. I therefore read **τράφει** = alit, *supports*, *nourishes*, see *Isth.* I. 48. Peleus lived in Iolcus, when Thetis was offered to him. Donaldson and Mr Fennell give φάτις and τράφειν, but the reading in the text involves less change.

45. **ἰόντων** κ.τ.λ.] *Let the tidings speed anon, straight to Chiron to his immortal cave.* Chiron's cave is σεμνὸν in *Pyth.* IX. 30, and here ἄφθιτον, as the abode of a seer. Cp. ἀθανάτου στόματος (*Pyth.* IV. 10) of the mouth of Medea.—**εὐθύ**, Hermann's emendation of MSS. εὐθύς (which is not needed with αὐτίκα), confirmed by the metre (but compare l. 23). **Χείρωνος** depends on εὐθύ.

μηδὲ Νηρέος θυγάτηρ νεικέων πέταλα δὶς ἐγγυαλιζέτω
ἄμμιν· ἐν διχομηνίδεσσιν δὲ Ϝεσπέραις ἐρατὸν
λύοι κεν χαλινὸν ὑφ' ἥρωι παρθενίας. ὣς φάτο Κρονίδαις
ἐννέποισα θεά· τοὶ δ' ἐπὶ γλεφάροις
νεῦσαν ἀθανάτοισιν· ἐπέων δὲ καρπὸς 50
οὐ κατέφθινε. φαντὶ γὰρ ξύν' ἀλέγειν

46. **μηδὲ** κ.τ.λ.] *And let not the daughter of Nereus twice lay leaves of strife in the hollows of our hands.*—**πέταλα νεικέων**, *a strife to be decided by leaves*, alludes to voting on olive leaves as in *petalismos* at Syracuse or the ἐκφυλλοφορία at Athens. Cp. above ἀγοραί, l. 29. The form of expression suggests that the metaphor is intended to be significant. A scholiast quotes κλάδον Ἐνυαλίου from Ibycus (*fr.* 29), cp. Homeric ὄζον Ἄρηος.—**ἐγγυαλίζειν** does not occur elsewhere in Pindar. It properly means to place in the hand hollowed to receive a gift.

47. **διχομηνίδεσσιν**] There are three forms, διχόμηνος, διχόμην, and διχόμηνις, meaning *month-dividing*, that is *at-the-fullmoon*. διχόμηνος is the prose form, occurring in Plutarch; διχόμην is used by Aratus. In *Ol.* III. 19 we have διχόμηνις χρυσάρματος Μήνα. For the good-luck of marriage at the full-moon see Euripides, *Iphigeneia at Aulis* 717, where Agamemnon fixes the union of Achilles and Iphigeneia, ὅταν σελήνης εὐτυχὴς ἔλθῃ κύκλος.—**Ϝεσπέραις**, not digammated elsewhere in Pindar; for the plural cp. νύκτες. With ἐρατόν in this connexion compare *Pyth.* IX. 12 καί σφιν ἐπὶ γλυκεραῖς εὐναῖς ἐρατὰν βάλεν αἰδῶ.

48. **χαλινὸν παρθενίας**] the maiden's girdle, ζώνη. Cp. λῦσε παρθενίην ζώνην, λ 245, where the subject of λῦσε is the man, the middle λύεσθαι being properly used of the maiden, here λύοι exceptionally (cp. Eur. *Alc.* 177). Pindar has χαλινός metaphorically of an anchor, θοᾶς Ἀργοῦς χαλινόν *Pyth.* IV. 25. Cp. Aesch. *P. V.* 562.—The condition implied by λύοι κεν is readily understood; *if you follow my counsel.* Translate: *But she might well undo the dear bridle that binds her maidenhead in the hero's embrace on a midmonth eventide.*

**Κρονίδαις**] Literally *the sons of Cronus*, Zeus and Poseidon, who are specially interested; not generally of the gods.

49. **τοὶ δ' ἐπὶ** κ.τ.λ.] *But they nodded assent with immortal eyelids; and the fruit of her speech withered not to death.* **ἐπι-νεῦσαν** (tmesis), only here in Pindar, who twice uses νεύω in the sense of nodding yea. ἐπινεύειν **γλεφάροις** is a variation on the Homeric ἐπινεύειν ὀφρύσι.

50. **καρπός**] Editors quote for the metaphor Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, 684 χρησμοὺς—μηδ' ἀκαρπώτους κτίσαι, *Sept. c. Thebas*, 614 εἰ καρπὸς ἔσται θεσφάτοισι Λοξίου. Here perhaps the καρπὸς ἐπέων (of the counsel of Themis) is opposed to the πέταλα νεικέων (of the quarrel which Themis allayed).

51. **κατέφθινε**, not elsewhere in Pindar. **ξύν' ἀλέγειν**] Hermann's emendation of συναλέγειν. It seems best to take **ξυνὰ καὶ γάμον** as a sort of hendiadys (so Mezger), ξυνά being the cognate and γάμον the ordinary accusative after ἀλέγειν. **ἄνακτα** is Zeus, and **ξυνά** means the communion of Zeus and Themis. For ξυνός of two associates cp. *Isth.* V. 36, and *Pyth.* IX. 13 ξυνὸν γάμον.—For ἄνακτα (to which B has the gloss τὸν Δία) Christ reads ἄνακτε (Zeus and Poseidon) after two Triclinian MSS., Kayser ἄνακτι (Peleus), and Bergk ἄνακτας (Cronidae; 'dicunt ipsos deos Thetidis nuptias carminibus celebravisse'). I do not like to change the text, as I

*καὶ γάμον Θέτιος ἄνακτα. καὶ νεαρὰν ἔδειξαν σοφῶν*
*στόματ' ἀπείροισιν ἀρετὰν Ἀχιλέος·*
*ὃ καὶ Μύσιον ἀμπελόεν*
*αἵμαξε Τηλέφου μέλανι ῥαίνων φόνῳ πεδίον,* 55

*στρ. ς'.*

*γεφύρωσέ τ' Ἀτρεΐδαισι νόστον, Ἑλέναν τ' ἐλύσατο, Τροΐας*
*ἶνας ἐκταμὼν δορί, ταί νιν ῥύοντό ποτε μάχας ἐναριμβρότου*

think it may well be right; but if ἄνακτα for Zeus be considered ambiguous, I would suggest Ζῆν' ἀλέγειν in the preceding line. In any case I do not feel certain that ξύν' is final.

52. **καὶ νεαράν**] The chief MSS. (B D) give *καὶ νε' ἀνέδειξαν*, but the reading of D and some Triclinian MSS., also appearing as a lemma in D, is *καὶ νέαν ἔδειξαν*. The difference is merely a matter of the division of words, and what the emendator has to deal with is

ΚΑΙΝΕΑΝΕΔΕΙΞΑΝ.

The scholia testify to both decipherments: *καὶ τὰ τῶν σοφῶν νέα στόματα, φησί, τοῖς ἀπείροις ἔδειξε τὴν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως ἀρετήν· οὐ γὰρ μόνος Ὅμηρος ἀλλὰ καὶ πλείους ἄλλοι νεώτεροι... § ἢ οὕτως· ἀεὶ δὲ θάλλειν* (D *βάλλειν*) *καὶ νεωτέραν εἶναι τοῖς ἀπείροις τὴν Ἀχιλλέως ἀρετὴν τὰ τῶν σοφῶν στόματα πεποίηκεν*. The words of the latter scholium ἀεὶ θάλλειν suggested to Bergk *αἰνέαν τ' ἔδειξαν*, a correction which he rashly introduced into his text. Schmid's emendation *καὶ νεαράν* involves very slight change and is generally accepted. The corruption may be explained by an intermediate stage ΝΕΑΝΑΝ. For *νεαρός*, *young*, see *Pyth.* X. 25 (in *Nem.* VIII. 20 it means *new*).

*And the mouths of bards revealed to them that wotted not the youthful excellence of Achilles.*—Observe the plural verb with *στόματα σοφῶν* = *σοφοί*.

54. **ὃ καὶ** κ.τ.λ.] *Who also made the vine-clad plains of Mysia run red with the black blood of Telephus.*—**ὃ**, see above l. 21. **καί**, not to mention other exploits (Dissen). **ἀμπελόεις** and **αἱμάσσω** occur only here in Pindar; and **ῥαίνω** elsewhere he only uses metaphorically.—**πεδίον** responds metrically to **πεδίον** in l. 44 (Mezger).—For the battle with Telephus, whom Achilles wounded, see *Isth.* IV. 41. Dionysus helped the Greeks in the conflict with Telephus, who was tripped up by a vine (whence the god was called Σφάλτης); and this incident is suggested by **ἀμπελόεν**.

56. **γεφύρωσε** κ.τ.λ.] *And he made a bridge homeward for the sons of Atreus, and delivered Helen, having cut out with his spear the sinews of Troy, which were checking him in his course, as he marshalled the work of man-spoiling fight in the plain,—even proud Memnon and high valiant Hector and other princes.*

The usual construction of *γεφυροῦν* is with an accusat. of the thing bridged, as *ποταμὸν γεφύρωσε*, *he made a bridge over a river*. But it also takes, as here, an accusative of the bridge-passage; cp. Ξ 357 *γεφύρωσε κέλευθον*.—With all editors I have adopted Heyne's **Ἀτρεΐδαισι**, but I am not sure that it is right. The MSS. have *Ἀτρεάδαισι*, and there is something to be said for Bergk's conjecture *Ἀργεάδαισι*, *the Argives* (see Stephanus Byz. *sub voce* Ἄργος).—**ἐλύσατο** (ŏ before Τρ), see *Introduction*, p. 136.

57. **ἶνας ἐκταμών**] The sinews are the Trojan heroes, *Μέμνονός τε βίαν* κ.τ.λ. in the following verses being in apposition with *ἶνας*. For *ἶνας ἐκταμεῖν* (= *νευροκοπεῖν*) used figuratively, cp. Plato, *Republic* 411 B *ἐκτέμνειν ὥσπερ τὰ νεῦρα ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς* (Donaldson).—**ῥύοντο** (*ἐρρύσατο Pyth.* XII. 19, not elsewhere in Pin-

*ἔργον ἐν πεδίῳ κορύσσοντα, Μέμνονός τε βίαν*
*ὑπέρθυμον Ἕκτορά τ' ἄλλους τ' ἀριστέας· οἷς δῶμα Φερσεφόνας*
*μανύων Ἀχιλεύς, οὖρος Αἰακιδᾶν,* 60
*Αἴγιναν σφετέραν τε ῥίζαν πρόφαινεν.*
*τὸν μὲν οὐδὲ θανόντ' ἀοιδαὶ ἔλιπον,*
*ἀλλά Ϝοι παρά τε πυρὰν τάφον θ' Ἑλικώνιαι παρθένοι*
*στάν, ἐπὶ θρῆνόν τε πολύφαμον ἔχεαν.*

dar) here means *stayed, checked, inhibebant*, a very strange use of *ῥύομαι*, to which I am unable to find an accurate parallel. The usual sense is *defend*, *preserve* (as in *Pyth.* XII. 19). If we did not look to the later part of the clause, we should naturally take *ταί μιν* (or *νιν*) *ῥύοντο* to mean 'which defended Troy'. It is possible that there is some deep-seated error in the text, but Bergk's *ῥύονθ' ὁπότε ...κορύσσοιτο* is not likely.—**ποτὶ μάχας** Schmid (and *ε' ϛ'*) for *ποτ' ἐκ μάχας* (a very natural error).—**ἐναρίμβροτος** occurs also in *Pyth.* VI. 30, there of Memnon.

58. **κορύσσοντα**] Cp. *Pyth.* VIII. 75 *βίον κορυσσέμεν* (*armare*) *ὀρθοβούλοισι μηχαναῖς*. Hesiod, *Scut. Her.* 198 *μάχην*; Β 273 *πόλεμόν τε κορύσσων*.—Note that Pindar will not have us forget that the valour of Achilles is shewn **ἐν πεδίῳ**.

59. **ὑπέρθυμον Ἕκτορά τ'**]=Ἕκτορά θ' ὑπέρθυμον. This Homeric adjective occurs also in *Pyth.* IV. 13 *ὑπερθύμων τε φωτῶν*. In the present passage there is perhaps a suggestion of overweeningness.—*Φερσεφόνας*, Boeckh for MSS. *Περσεφόνας*.

**οἷς** κ.τ.λ.] *To whom Achilles, warder of the Aeacids, revealed the hall of Persephone and thereby lifted to heaven's light Aegina and the root of Aeacus.*

60. **μανύων**] *announcing*, *making known* (a solemn word used ironically). I conjecture that both *μανύων* and *πρόφαινεν* are borrowed from the language of the mysteries. Cp. *Nem.* IX. 4 *αὐδὰν μανύει ἐπόπταις*.—**οὖρος**, so Nestor is called in Homer *οὖρος Ἀχαιῶν*.

61. **σφετέραν**]=*Αἰακιδᾶν*.—**ῥίζαν πρόφαινεν** reminds us of the passage in the choral ode of the *Antigone* where a light is stretched over the root of the house of the Labdacidae. *προφαίνω*, *bring into light*, occurs in *frag.* 42; cp. also *πρόφατος* (*Ol.* VIII. 16) and *πρόφαντος* (*Ol.* I. 120).—For the context Dissen well compares *τηλαυγὲς φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν*, *Nem.* III. 61.

62. **τὸν μὲν** κ.τ.λ.] *And even after death songs failed him not, but the maids of Helicon stood beside his pyre and tomb, and poured over him a lament of many voices.*—**οὐδέ**, Boeckh for MSS. *οὔτε*.—Hermann reads *ἀοιδαί γ' ἔλιπον* to obviate the hiatus, which is of an uncommon kind.

63. **Ἑλικώνιαι**] In *Isth.* II. 34 the Muses are named *Ἑλικωνιάδες*. Dissen notes the point of the designation here: 'suaviter ut significet Boeotias fuisse Musas, quae Achillem canerent, quemadmodum nunc Boeotiae Musae Aeginam canunt virosque eius egregios'.—For the dirge of the Muses and Nereids over Achilles see ω 60.

64. **στάν**] Mingarelli for MSS. *ἔσταν*.

**πολύφαμον**] This word, not elsewhere occurring in Pindar, has two meanings in Homer: it is an epithet (1) of *ἀγορά*, β 150, in the sense *many-voiced*, cp. Alcman, *frag.* 34 *ὅκα θεοῖσιν ἅδῃ πολύφαμος ἑορτά*, and (2) of *ἀοιδός*, χ 376, *having many tales to tell.* A third possible meaning is (3) *famous* (cp. *πολύφατος*, a Pindaric adjective), and it is thus explained by Rumpel here. Liddell and Scott place *θρῆνον πολύφαμον* in the same category as *πολύφαμος ἀοιδός*. I have no doubt

*ἔδοξ' ἄρα παρ' ἀθανάτοις,* 65
*ἐσλόν γε φῶτα καὶ φθίμενον ὕμνοις θεᾶν διδόμεν.*

*στρ. ζ'.*

*τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον, ἔσσυταί τε Μοισαῖον ἅρμα Νικοκλέος*
*μνᾶμα πυγμάχου κελαδῆσαι γεραιρέμεν θ', ὃς Ἴσθμιον ἀν νάπος*

however that here Pindar used the word in sense (1), which is evidently most fitting. Perhaps he had the special intention of suggesting a *πολύφαμος ἀγορά*, and thus signalling to l. 29 *μακάρων ἐμέμναντ' ἀγοραί*. Achilles in death, like Peleus in life, was *remembered* by companies of immortals. That *πολύφαμος* would have immediately suggested an *ἀγορά* of speakers, we may with some confidence conclude from the phrase *ἐς πολύφημον ἐξενεῖκαι* (bring forth to a public assembly), which occurs in an oracle quoted by Pindar's contemporary Herodotus, v. 79.

**ἐπὶ—ἔχεαν** (MSS. *ἔχευαν*, emended by Schmid); this compound is not found elsewhere in Pindar.

65. **παρ' ἀθανάτοις**] *So it was resolved in the court of heaven to deliver so good a man, even after death, to the hymns of goddesses.*—Most editors adopt the reading of D *καὶ ἀθανάτοις*, but there are two objections. (1) It is impossible to explain the genesis of *δ' ἀθανάτοις* the reading of B, if *καί* is right; (2) *καί* 'tribus versibus continuis repetitum displicet'. Boeckh proposed *τόδ'*, Bergk *τότ'*, but neither of these conjectures carries with it an explanation of the corruption. On the other hand it is obvious how easily **παρ'**, which I have restored, might have dropped out of the text:

ΕΔΟΞΑΡΑΠΑΡΑΘΑΝΑΤΟΙΣ

*καί* and *δ'* were makeshifts to repair the line. *παρά* is used half in a local sense (*apud*), partly in the figurative sense which it bears, for example, in *Pyth.* II. 72 *καλός τοι πίθων παρὰ παισίν*.

66. **ἐσλόν γε**] That is *ἅτε ἐσλὸν ὄντα*. The MSS. have *ἐς λόγον γε*. Bergk well shews how the mistake arose:

ΟΝ
ΕΣΛΟΓΓΕ

**καὶ φθίμενον** lays stress again on the fact, already rendered prominent by *οὐδὲ θανόντα*, that praise was given to one dead.

**θεᾶν**] So Triclinian MSS., and all editors. The old MSS. have *θεάν*, which is certainly translatable, as referring to Thetis ('that the goddess should give'), but yields poor sense.

67. **τὸ καὶ κ.τ.λ.**] *And their judgment herein is right, now as then, and the car of the Muses speeds to sound memorial praises of the boxer Nicocles, and to honour him, who won Dorian selinon in the Isthmian glen.*—**τό**, *which thing*, the tenor of the preceding verse, *ὃ ἔδοξε παρ' ἀθανάτοις*.—**καί**, as well as on that occasion.—**φέρει λόγον**, bears reason as its burden, is reasonable; a poetical recasting of *ἔχει λόγον*.—Of *σεύομαι* Pindar has the following forms: *σύτο*, **ἔσσυται**, *ἐσσυμένα*, *ἐσσύμενοι*, *ἐσσυμένως*. The figure of the chariot of the Muses is worked out in *Ol.* VI. 24 sqq.

68. **μνᾶμα**] Cognate object of *κελαδῆσαι*; the ode is a funeral monument.

**γεραιρέμεν θ' ὃς κ.τ.λ.**] MSS. *γεραίρεταί μιν*, Hermann *γέραιρέ τέ μιν*, Bothe and most editors *γεραίρετέ μιν*. To this, the usual reading, there are serious objections. (1) There is no apparent reason why *γεραίρετε* should have become the unmeaning *γεραίρεται*. (2) The imperative is here out of place. Who are addressed? The *ἅλικες* are not addressed until l. 72. It seems evident that the sentence beginning with *τὸ καὶ νῦν* in l. 67 is not broken at *κελαδῆσαι*, but continues to *σελίνων*, the antecedent to *ὅς* being Νικο-

Δωρίων ἔλαχεν σελίνων· ἐπεὶ περικτίονας
ἐνίκασε δή ποτε καὶ κεῖνος ἄνδρας ἀφύκτῳ χερὶ κλονέων. 70
τὸν μὲν οὐ κατελέγχει κριτοῦ γενεὰ
πατραδελφεοῦ· ἁλίκων τῷ τις ἁβρὸν
ἀμφὶ παγκρατίου Κλεάνδρῳ πλεκέτω
μυρσίνας στέφανον. ἐπεί νιν Ἀλκαθόου τ' ἀγὼν σὺν τύχᾳ

κλέος πυγμάχου. If this be so, and if the letters γεραιρ- are right (there is no reason to suspect them), it is obvious that the corruption conceals an infinitive coordinate with κελαδῆσαι. This reasoning is strikingly confirmed by the evidence of a scholium (Abel, p. 509): διὸ καὶ νῦν ὁ λόγος ἡμᾶς παρορμᾷ καὶ τὸ τῶν Μουσῶν ἅρμα τοῦ πυκτικωτάτου Νικοκλέος τὸ μνῆμα καὶ τὴν τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἀρετὴν ὑμνῆσαι **καὶ τιμῆσαι αὐτὸν** ὡς Ἴσθμια αὐτοῦ νενικηκότος τοῦ Νικοκλέος φησί.

The metre at once suggests **γεραιρέμεν θ' ὅς** (cp. l. 35), and now we are in a position to explain the corruption. The original mistake arose in misdividing ΓΕΡΑΙΡΕΜΕΝΤΕ as γέραιρε μέν τε, and the reading in our MSS. is a compound of two attempts at correction: (1) γέραιρέ **μιν**, (2) **γεραίρεται** μὲν, the τε or θ' having been naturally discarded at once as a blunder.

**ἀν νάπος**] restored by Hermann for MSS. ἀνάπο, ἀναπί, ἄναπ. Pindar has νάπος in *Pyth.* V. 38 of a valley at Delphi, νάπα also of a part of Delphi (*Pyth.* VI. 9), and of Nemea (*Isth.* III. A 12). Euripides, *Ion* 176, has νάπος Ἰσθμιον. For **ἀν** see *Appendix* H.

69. **Δωρίων**] See note on *Isth.* II. 16. —**περικτίονας ἄνδρας**, men from the surrounding districts; cp. *Nem.* XI. 19.

70. **ἐνίκασε δή**] *conquered indeed.* δή goes with the verb, not with **ποτε**. So in *Ol.* IX. 9 τὸ δή ποτε, connect τὸ δή closely.—**καὶ κεῖνος** (Boeckh for MSS. κἀκεῖνος), *he as well as Cleander.*— **ἀφύκτῳ χερὶ** (old MSS. ἀφύκτε χειρί) **κλονέων**, *tossing with resistless hand.* ἄφυκτος is often used of an arrow, *unerring.* κλονέω occurs in one other place in Pindar, of sands tossed by waves and winds (*Pyth.* IX. 48).—Observe χερὶ before κλ.

71. **τὸν μὲν** κ.τ.λ.] *On him* (Nicocles) *is no shame laid by the offspring of his father's noble brother.*—Nicocles was the son of a brother of Telesarchus and therefore cousin of Cleander. κατελέγχω, in the sense of shaming by falling short of what is expected of one, is not uncommon in Pindar, occurring in three other places: *Pyth.* VIII. 36, *Ol.* VIII. 19 and *Isth.* III. A 14.—**κριτοῦ**, *distinguished, select*, also in *Pyth.* IV. 50. For **γενεά**= *son*, cp. above *Isth.* V. 3. (MSS. γενεάν, corrected by Triclinius.)

72. **πᾰτραδελφεοῦ**] This form of πατράδελφος only here. For ᾰ see above *Isth.* I. 12.

**ἁλίκων** κ.τ.λ.] *Therefore let one of his comrades weave for Cleander a luxurious wreath of myrtle for the sake of the pancration.*—**τῷ**, see above, l. 4. For the idiom with **τις** see note on l. 2.—For **ἀμφί** with genitive in this sense cp. *Pyth.* IV. 276 τλᾶθι τᾶς εὐδαίμονος ἀμφὶ Κυράνας σπουδὰν θέμεν.

74. **μυρσίνας**] In *Isth.* III. B 70 μύρτος.

**Ἀλκαθόου**] The *Alcathoea* were held at Megara in honour of Alcathous son of Pelops, who killed the lion of Cithaeron. *Asclepiea* were celebrated at Epidaurus. At one or both of these games the prize was a wreath of myrtle.—**σὺν τύχᾳ**, the emphatic words of the sentence; 'and his coming thither was crowned with success'. So too (in *Nem.* X.) Theaeus is described as τύχᾳ μολών to places

(1) μὲν—ἀλλά.

The following instances occur in Pindar:

1. *Ol.* IX. 1 τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος (ἄρκεσε)—5 ἀλλὰ νῦν—ἐπίνειμαι (where the change from indic. to imper. is to be observed).

2. *Ol.* IX. 50 χθόνα μὲν κατακλύσαι μέλαιναν ὕδατος σθένος, ἀλλὰ Ζηνὸς τέχναις ἀνάπωτιν ἐξαίφνας ἄντλον ἑλεῖν. The opposition could not well be stronger.

3. *Ol.* X. 85.

4. *Pyth.* I. 22 ἁμέραισιν μέν—ἀλλ' ἐν ὄρφναισιν.

5. *Pyth.* I. 55 ἀσθενεῖ μὲν χρωτὶ βαίνων, ἀλλὰ μοιρίδιον ἦν.

6, 7. *Pyth.* IV. 139, and 273 (ῥᾴδιον μὲν—ἀλλὰ δυσπαλές).

8. *Pyth.* III. 47 (μέν—54 ἀλλά).

9. *Isth.* IV. 46 (μέν—51 ἀλλά). Change from indic. to imper. as in 1 above.

*Nem.* II. 19. This case is different. There is no marked opposition between the various places where the Timodemids won their victories, and we must explain the passage as an intentional anacoluthon. It is as if Pindar had written: 'And now I will enumerate the distinctions of the Timodemids. First, at Pytho four victories;—but the first item is far from exhausting the list; they won eight crowns at Isthmus, seven at Nemea, countless at home'. This case then really belongs to (2).

In one case we find μέν—ἀτάρ: *Pyth.* IV. 168. In *Pyth.* II. 89 ὃς ἀνέχει τότε μὲν τὰ κείνων, τότ' αὖθ' ἑτέροις ἔδωκεν μέγα κῦδος, the reading is not certain, the MSS. having τότε δ' αὖθ' which creates a metrical difficulty. There are however doubts about the text in the corresponding lines of some of the other epodes.

(2) μέν—

μέν may have no δέ formally answering to it, (*a*) owing to a change in the form of the sentence. This case is not infrequent in dialogue, as a speaker's sentences are certain to be interrupted and altered in the process of conversation. Or, if the μέν clause is long and rambling, an anacoluthon is a natural result. Or again, in some cases a point may be made by breaking the expected course of the sentence, and expressing the sense of the δέ clause in another form. (*b*) The correlative clause may be designedly omitted altogether and left to the understanding of the audience or the reader, with a view to some

rhetorical effect[1]. It may be sometimes convenient to say 'the spirit is willing' without making any explicit reference to the flesh.

(*a*) 1. *Ol.* III. 19 ἤδη γὰρ αὐτῷ, πατρὶ μὲν βωμῶν ἁγισθέντων, διχόμηνις ὅλον χρυσάρματος ἑσπέρας ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντέφλεξε Μήνα. Here the μέν clause is placed, in participial form, in the middle of the clause which regularly would be introduced by δέ. Strictly the sentence should consist of two members: πατρὶ μὲν βωμοὶ ἁγίσθησαν, αὐτῷ δὲ κ.τ.λ. There is a close parallel in the *Odyssey*, ο 405 οὔ τι περιπληθὴς λίην τόσον ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ μέν, 'good certainly but not so very large'.

2. *Pyth.* II. 58 πρύτανι κύριε πολλᾶν μὲν εὐστεφάνων ἀγυιᾶν καὶ στρατοῦ. εἰ δέ τις | ἤδη κτεάτεσσί τε καὶ περὶ τιμᾷ λέγει | ἕτερόν τιν'— γενέσθαι ὑπέρτερον κ.τ.λ. Here the answering clause should properly have been πολλῶν δὲ κτεάτων καὶ τιμᾶς (or something of the kind) depending on πρύτανι κύριε. A new sentence elaborates this idea, but the δέ which introduces it answers grammatically, not to the expressed (πολλᾶν) μέν, but to an unexpressed μέν which must now be understood with πρύτανι κύριε.

(*b*) 3. *Ol.* XIII. 104 νῦν δ' ἔλπομαι μέν, ἐν θεῷ γε μὰν τέλος. 'Hopes I have,—but I will not add a word more; God disposes'.

4. *Nem.* III. 83 (see my note *ad loc.*).

5. *Nem.* V. 25 αἱ δὲ πρώτιστον μὲν ὕμνησαν Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι σεμνὰν Θέτιν | Πηλέα θ', ὥς τέ νιν ἁβρὰ Κρηθεὶς κ.τ.λ. The first song of the Muses was concerning Peleus, and as it is only with this song that the poet had to do, there was no necessity to add explicitly what μὲν implies, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ ἄλλους ὕμνους ὕμνησαν. It seems to me that this is decidedly the right explanation. I hardly believe that ὥς τε here stands for ἔπειτα δὲ ὡς (which would in itself be admissible), because the first hymn evidently consists of the whole story of Peleus.

6. *Isth.* IV. 3—5; see *note.*

7. *Pyth.* XI. 46 τὰ μὲν ἐν ἅρμασι καλλίνικοι πάλαι Ὀλυμπίᾳ τ' ἀγώνων ...ἔσχον ἀκτῖνα σὺν ἵπποις· Πυθοῖ τε γυμνὸν ἐπὶ στάδιον καταβάντες ἤλεγξαν κ.τ.λ. It is generally supposed that τὰ μὲν is answered by Πυθοῖ τε, a contrast being drawn between the chariot-race and the foot-race. But, if taken thus, Ὀλυμπίᾳ τ' is harsh, and σὺν ἵπποις is superfluous. It is almost certain that ἅρμασι is corrupt and the suggestion

[1] Sometimes merely for the sake of brevity as in *Oed. Rex* 18 ἱερῆς, ἐγὼ μὲν Ζηνός, where οἱ δὲ ἄλλων θεῶν is the obvious supplement (see Jebb's note). In Aeschylus, *Supp.* 337, σθένος μὲν οὕτως μεῖζον αὔξεται βροτοῖς, the force of μέν is 'whatever may be the case with other things'.

(1) μὲν—ἀλλά.

The following instances occur in Pindar:

1. *Ol.* IX. 1 τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος (ἄρκεσε)—5 ἀλλὰ νῦν—ἐπίνειμαι (where the change from indic. to imper. is to be observed).

2. *Ol.* IX. 50 χθόνα μὲν κατακλύσαι μέλαιναν ὕδατος σθένος, ἀλλὰ Ζηνὸς τέχναις ἀνάπωτιν ἐξαίφνας ἄντλον ἑλεῖν. The opposition could not well be stronger.

3. *Ol.* x. 85.

4. *Pyth.* I. 22 ἀμέραισιν μέν—ἀλλ' ἐν ὄρφναισιν.

5. *Pyth.* I. 55 ἀσθενεῖ μὲν χρωτὶ βαίνων, ἀλλὰ μοιρίδιον ἦν.

6, 7. *Pyth.* IV. 139, and 273 (ῥᾴδιον μὲν—ἀλλὰ δυσπαλές).

8. *Pyth.* III. 47 (μέν—54 ἀλλά).

9. *Isth.* IV. 46 (μέν—51 ἀλλά). Change from indic. to imper. as in 1 above.

*Nem.* II. 19. This case is different. There is no marked opposition between the various places where the Timodemids won their victories, and we must explain the passage as an intentional anacoluthon. It is as if Pindar had written: 'And now I will enumerate the distinctions of the Timodemids. First, at Pytho four victories;—but the first item is far from exhausting the list; they won eight crowns at Isthmus, seven at Nemea, countless at home'. This case then really belongs to (2).

In one case we find μέν—ἀτάρ: *Pyth.* IV. 168. In *Pyth.* II. 89 ὃς ἀνέχει τότε μὲν τὰ κείνων, τότ' αὖθ' ἑτέροις ἔδωκεν μέγα κῦδος, the reading is not certain, the MSS. having τότε δ' αὖθ' which creates a metrical difficulty. There are however doubts about the text in the corresponding lines of some of the other epodes.

(2) μέν— .

μέν may have no δέ formally answering to it, (*a*) owing to a change in the form of the sentence. This case is not infrequent in dialogue, as a speaker's sentences are certain to be interrupted and altered in the process of conversation. Or, if the μέν clause is long and rambling, an anacoluthon is a natural result. Or again, in some cases a point may be made by breaking the expected course of the sentence, and expressing the sense of the δέ clause in another form. (*b*) The correlative clause may be designedly omitted altogether and left to the understanding of the audience or the reader, with a view to some

rhetorical effect[1]. It may be sometimes convenient to say 'the spirit is willing' without making any explicit reference to the flesh.

(*a*) 1. *Ol.* III. 19 ἤδη γὰρ αὐτῷ, πατρὶ μὲν βωμῶν ἁγισθέντων, διχόμηνις ὅλον χρυσάρματος ἑσπέρας ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντέφλεξε Μήνα. Here the μέν clause is placed, in participial form, in the middle of the clause which regularly would be introduced by δέ. Strictly the sentence should consist of two members: πατρὶ μὲν βωμοὶ ἁγίσθησαν, αὐτῷ δὲ κ.τ.λ. There is a close parallel in the *Odyssey*, ο 405 οὔ τι περιπληθὴς λίην τόσον ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ μέν, 'good certainly but not so very large'.

2. *Pyth.* II. 58 πρύτανι κύριε πολλᾶν μὲν εὐστεφάνων ἀγυιᾶν καὶ στρατοῦ. εἰ δέ τις | ἤδη κτεάτεσσί τε καὶ περὶ τιμᾷ λέγει | ἕτερόν τιν'— γενέσθαι ὑπέρτερον κ.τ.λ. Here the answering clause should properly have been πολλῶν δὲ κτεάτων καὶ τιμᾶς (or something of the kind) depending on πρύτανι κύριε. A new sentence elaborates this idea, but the δέ which introduces it answers grammatically, not to the expressed (πολλᾶν) μέν, but to an unexpressed μέν which must now be understood with πρύτανι κύριε.

(*b*) 3. *Ol.* XIII. 104 νῦν δ' ἔλπομαι μέν, ἐν θεῷ γε μὰν τέλος. 'Hopes I have,—but I will not add a word more; God disposes'.

4. *Nem.* III. 83 (see my note *ad loc.*).

5. *Nem.* V. 25 αἱ δὲ πρώτιστον μὲν ὕμνησαν Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι σεμνὰν Θέτιν | Πηλέα θ', ὥς τέ νιν ἁβρὰ Κρηθεὶς κ.τ.λ. The first song of the Muses was concerning Peleus, and as it is only with this song that the poet had to do, there was no necessity to add explicitly what μὲν implies, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ ἄλλους ὕμνους ὕμνησαν. It seems to me that this is decidedly the right explanation. I hardly believe that ὥς τε here stands for ἔπειτα δὲ ὡς (which would in itself be admissible), because the first hymn evidently consists of the whole story of Peleus.

6. *Isth.* IV. 3—5; see *note*.

7. *Pyth.* XI. 46 τὰ μὲν ἐν ἅρμασι καλλίνικοι πάλαι Ὀλυμπίᾳ τ' ἀγώνων ...ἔσχον ἀκτῖνα σὺν ἵπποις· Πυθοῖ τε γυμνὸν ἐπὶ στάδιον καταβάντες ἤλεγξαν κ.τ.λ. It is generally supposed that τὰ μὲν is answered by Πυθοῖ τε, a contrast being drawn between the chariot-race and the foot-race. But, if taken thus, Ὀλυμπίᾳ τ' is harsh, and σὺν ἵπποις is superfluous. It is almost certain that ἅρμασι is corrupt and the suggestion

[1] Sometimes merely for the sake of brevity as in *Oed. Rex* 18 ἱερῆς, ἐγὼ μὲν Ζηνός, where οἱ δὲ ἄλλων θεῶν is the obvious supplement (see Jebb's note). In Aeschylus, *Supp.* 337, σθένος μὲν οὕτως μεῖζον αὔξεται βροτοῖς, the force of μὲν is 'whatever may be the case with other things'.

of Bergk that we should read ἔργμασι is very plausible. The same corruption is found in *frag.* 38, and can easily be accounted for. ἔργμασι was written ἔρμασι (as B has in *Nem.* I. 7), and the bad correction ἅρμασι was suggested by the context (θοαῖς σὺν ἵπποις). τὰ μὲν ἐν ἔργμασι then means 'as to achievements in games'; and the answering δέ clause is not formally expressed. But it is suggested by the somewhat abrupt transition into the delicate subject of politics. The poet proceeds:

> θεόθεν ἐραίμαν καλῶν,
> δυνατὰ μαιόμενος ἐν ἁλικίᾳ.
> τῶν γὰρ ἀνὰ πόλιν εὑρίσκων τὰ μέσα μακροτέρῳ
> ὄλβῳ τεθαλότα, μέμφομ' αἶσαν τυραννίδων·
> ξυναῖσι δ' ἀμφ' ἀρεταῖς τέταμαι κ.τ.λ.

Dissen's *dissuadetur affectatio tyrannidis* expresses the import of the implied δέ clause.

### (3) μὲν—τε.

Sometimes the clause answering to μέν is introduced by τε in order to avoid the repetition of a word or phrase. Thus τε takes the place of δέ + some word or words.

1. *Ol.* VII. 12 may be taken as a type. The expression 'often with the lyre, often with the flute', should regularly appear as θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι, θαμὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ. But if metrical or any other considerations prompt the poet to be concise, he may substitute τε for θαμὰ δέ. Accordingly we find here

> θαμὰ μὲν φόρμιγγι, παμφώνοισί τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν αὐλῶν.

Similarly in

2. *Nem.* II. 9 θαμὰ μὲν Ἰσθμιάδων δρέπεσθαι κάλλιστον ἄωτον ἐν Πυθίοισί τε νικᾶν.
τε = θαμὰ δέ.

3. *Ol.* IV. 16 μάλα μὲν τροφαῖς ἑτοῖμον ἵππων χαίροντά τε ξενίαις.
τε = μάλα δέ.

4. *Ol.* VI. 4 εἰ δ' εἴη μὲν Ὀλυμπιονίκας βωμῷ τε μαντείῳ.
τε = εἴη δέ.

5. *Ol.* VII. 88 τίμα μὲν ὕμνου τεθμὸν—ἄνδρα τε.
τε = τίμα δέ.

6. *Pyth.* II. 31 τὸ μὲν ἥρως ὅτι κ.τ.λ.—ὅτι τε κ.τ.λ.
τε = τὸ δέ.

7. *Nem.* VII. 86 σέο δὲ προπρεῶνα μὲν ξεῖνον ἀδελφεόν τ'.
τε = προπρεῶνα δέ.

8. *Nem.* VIII. 30 τὰ μὲν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλεῖ—ἄλλων τε κ.τ.λ.
τε = τὰ δέ.

9. *Pyth.* IV. 249

κτεῖνε μὲν γλαυκῶπα τέχναις ποικιλόνωτον ὄφιν
ὦ 'ρκεσίλα, κλέψεν τε Μήδειαν σὺν αὐτῷ, τὰν Πελίαο φόνον.

(The MSS. have αὐτᾷ; but σὺν αὐτᾷ = σὺν τῇ Μηδείᾳ θελούσῃ καὶ ἐνεργούσῃ is intolerably harsh, and some mention of the winning of the fleece, the quest of the expedition, is imperatively demanded. The reading αὐτῷ is mentioned in the scholia and is certainly right. It refers to the δέρμα λαμπρόν (l. 241) which is described (244) as lying in the thicket, κεῖτο γὰρ λόχμᾳ, κ.τ.λ. The emphatic pronoun is not ambiguous; it could not refer to anything save the fleece.)

κλέψεν τε σὺν αὐτῷ = κλέψεν δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ κλέψεν Μήδειαν.

10. *Ol.* III. 6 χαίταισι μὲν ζευχθέντες ἔπι στέφανοι πράσσοντί με—χρέος—, ἅ τε Πίσα με γεγωνεῖν.
τε = πράσσει δὲ χρέος.

11. *Isth.* II. 37 : see *note.*
Possibly also

12. *Isth.* I. 14, 15, where if we read τεύχω and keep τὸ μέν (see note), τ' may represent τό δέ (cp. above 6). A similar instance of a sentence, in which the verb precedes the μέν clause, but the regular course of the construction is so altered that the δέ clause is displaced, occurs in Sophocles, *Antigone*, 1161 :

Κρέων γὰρ ἦν ζηλωτός, ὡς ἐμοί, ποτέ,
σώσας μὲν ἐχθρῶν τήνδε Καδμείαν χθόνα
λαβών τε χώρας παντελῆ μοναρχίαν
ηὔθυνε θάλλων εὐγενεῖ τέκνων σπορᾷ.

Regularly the sentence should have run: Κρέων γὰρ ἦν ζηλωτός, σώσας μὲν χθόνα, λαβὼν δὲ μοναρχίαν καὶ εὐθύνων, two participial clauses qualifying ἦν ζηλωτός. But the construction is changed; the second clause becomes an independent sentence, coordinate with ἦν ζηλωτός; hence δέ is no longer in place.

In the *Philoctetes* there are three instances of τε = a word mentally repeated from the μέν clause + δέ.

l. 1058 πάρεστι μὲν
Τεῦκρος παρ' ἡμῖν τήνδ' ἐπιστήμην ἔχων
ἐγώ θ'.

Here θ' = πάρειμι δέ. (Compare Professor Jebb's note.)

l. 1137 ὁρῶν μὲν αἰσχρὰς ἀπάτας, στυγνόν τε φῶτ'—.
τε = ὁρῶν δέ.

l. 1424 πρῶτον μὲν νόσου παύσει λυγρᾶς
ἀρετῇ τε πρῶτος ἐκκριθεὶς στρατεύματος.
τε = ἔπειτα δέ.

But in the lines which immediately follow we can hardly see another example:

1426 Πάριν μὲν ὃς τῶνδ' αἴτιος κακῶν ἔφυ,
τόξοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖσι νοσφίσεις βίου
πέρσεις τε Τροίαν, σκῦλά τ' εἰς μέλαθρα σὰ
πέμψεις ἀριστεῖ' ἐκλαβὼν στρατεύματος
Ποίαντι πατρὶ πρὸς πάτρας Οἴτης πλάκα.
1431 ἃ δ' ἂν λάβῃς σὺ σκῦλα τοῦδε τοῦ στρατοῦ
τόξων ἐμῶν μνημεῖα πρὸς πυρὰν ἐμὴν
κόμιζε.

Professor Jebb thinks that πέρσεις τε answers to Πάριν μέν, but he adds (in reference to both 1425 and 1428): 'Possibly τε ought to be δέ in one of the two places or in both; but in each case the τε may be a trace of the somewhat careless writing which appears in this speech'. I would suggest that the two cases are different. ἀρετῇ τε is normal; but perhaps it is not necessary to suppose that πέρσεις τε Τροίαν answers to Πάριν μέν. There was nothing to hinder Sophocles from writing Τροίαν δὲ πέρσεις. I suggest that the δέ clause comes in 1431; there is an opposition between the winning of the spoils by the sack of Troy and the use to which they are to be put[1].

The following cases which I have noticed in the tragedians are in accordance with the rule here formulated.

Aeschylus, *S. c. Th.* 925
πολλὰ μὲν πολίτας
ξένων τε πάντων στίχας.
τε = πολλὰ δέ.

*Supp.* 410 πρῶτα μὲν πόλει
αὐτοῖσί θ' ἡμῖν ἐκτελευτήσει καλῶς.
τε = ἔπειτα δέ (as *Phil.* 1424).

[*Supp.* 197, Mr Tucker rightly explains as an anacoluthon.]

[1] In *Oed. Rex* 497 ὁ μὲν οὖν Ζεὺς ὅ τ' Ἀπόλλων κ.τ.λ., μὲν is answered by δὲ in 499, ἀνδρῶν δ'. The opposition might have been more fully expressed by θεῶν μὲν οὖν ὁ Ζεὺς κ.τ.λ.

*Choeph.* 975

σεμνοὶ μὲν ἦσαν ἐν θρόνοις τόθ᾽ ἥμενοι
φίλοι τε καὶ νῦν.

(φίλοι) τε = (φίλοι) δέ εἰσιν.

Sophocles, *Trach.* 1011

πολλὰ μὲν ἐν πόντῳ κατά τε δρία πάντα καθαίρων.

τε = πολλὰ δὲ (κατὰ δρία πάντα).

Euripides, *Heracl.* 337

πρωτὰ μὲν σκοποὺς
πέμψω πρὸς αὐτόν, μὴ λάθῃ με προσπεσών·...
μάντεις τ᾽ ἀθροίσας θύσομαι.

τε = ἔπειτα δέ.

*Hippol.* 996 πρῶτα μὲν θεοὺς σέβειν
φίλοις τε χρῆσθαι.

τε = ἔπειτα δέ.

*Orestes* 22

ᾧ παρθένοι μὲν τρεῖς ἔφυμεν ἐκ μιᾶς
Χρυσόθεμις Ἰφιγένειά τ᾽ Ἠλέκτρα τ᾽ ἐγώ,
ἄρσην τ᾽ Ὀρέστης.

Here τ᾽ may stand for ἔφυ δὲ, as ἔφυμεν does not include Orestes. But perhaps it is better explained as a slight anacoluthon. The double τε in the preceding line might lead Electra involuntarily to finish her enumeration of Agamemnon's children with another τε, though she had intended to mark off the male offspring by a δέ.

There are two good instances in the *Medea*, l. 430: πολλὰ μὲν ἁμετέραν ἀνδρῶν τε μοῖραν εἰπεῖν (where τε = πολλὰ δέ), and l. 125 πρῶτα μὲν εἰπεῖν τοὔνομα νικᾷ, χρῆσθαί τε μακρῷ λῷστα βροτοῖσιν (τε = ἔπειτα δέ).

It is interesting to observe that a difficult passage in Thucydides, II. 65, 12, may be explained, without resorting to emendation, in accordance with the view here put forward of μέν followed by τε. Notwithstanding the disaster in Sicily, Thucydides says, and the factions in the city, the Athenians

ὅμως τρία μὲν ἔτη ἀντεῖχον τοῖς τε πρότερον ὑπάρχουσι πολεμίοις καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ Σικελίας μετ᾽ αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων ἔτι τοῖς πλείοσιν ἀφεστηκόσι, Κύρῳ τε ὕστερον βασιλέως παιδὶ προσγενομένῳ, ὃς παρεῖχε χρήματα Πελοποννησίοις ἐς τὸ ναυτικόν· καὶ οὐ πρότερον ἐνέδοσαν ἢ αὐτοὶ ἐν σφίσι κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας διαφορὰς περιπεσόντες ἐσφάλησαν.

The mention of the στάσις (καὶ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἤδη ἐν στάσει ὄντες) shews that Thucydides began his reckoning from the year 411.

'Three years' brings us down to 408. Cyrus according to the ordinary chronology came down to the coast in spring 407. It would be strange if the historian, wishing to shew how long the Athenian power held out, should have reckoned only the first three years in figures and not indicated the whole number. Hence *δέκα* has been proposed for *τρία*. But *δέκα* gives too long a period, even if we were to count from 413 in defiance of the express words *ἤδη ἐν στάσει.* No emendation is necessary, nor is it needful to suppose with Krüger that Cyrus came down to the coast in spring 408. The total number of years which Thucydides had in mind was six (spring 410[1]—spring 404). The appearance of Cyrus on the scene of Greek politics divides the period into two equal parts of three years each. The first triad was 410, 409, 408; the second triad 407, 406, 405. But instead of *τρία μὲν ἔτη—, τρία δὲ ἔτη Κύρῳ κ.τ.λ.* Thucydides has used the abbreviation *τε* and avoided the repetition of *τρία ἔτη.*

I may now come to some passages in Pindar where it has been erroneously thought that *τε* stands for *δέ.*

*Pyth.* VI. 39

*πρίατο μὲν θανάτοιο κομιδὰν πατρός,*
40 *ἐδόκησέν τε τῶν πάλαι γενεᾷ*
*ὁπλοτέροισιν—*
*τὰ μὲν παρίκει·*
44 *τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος κ.τ.λ.*

This passage has been misapprehended. *μέν* in 39 does not answer to *τε* in 40. The opposition is between the piety of Antilochus in ancient times and the filial obedience of Thrasybulus in modern days. This might have been expressed simply *πρίατο μὲν κ.τ.λ. πάλαι—τῶν νῦν δέ,* but Pindar expresses the incidental *πάλαι* of l. 40 more formally in 43. The second *μέν* is simply a resumption of the first; and there is only one contrast.

*Pyth.* XI. 31 *θάνεν μέν*, opposed not to *μάντιν τ' ὄλεσσε* l. 33, but to *ὁ δ' ἄρα* l. 34.

*Ol.* VI. 88 *ὄτρυνον νῦν ἑταίρους Αἰνέα πρῶτον μὲν Ἥραν Παρθενίαν κελαδῆσαι* corresponds not to *γνῶναι τ' ἔπειτ'* in the next line but to *εἰπὸν δὲ μεμνᾶσθαι Συρακοσσᾶν* in l. 92. Strictly *μέν* should have followed *ὄτρυνον*, but the passage is easily explained as an anacoluthon. It begins as if two infinitives depending on *ὄτρυνον* were to be con-

[1] It is to be observed that this period of six years coincides with the part of the war which Thucydides did not record himself. His history closes with autumn 411.

trasted by μέν and δέ,—πρῶτον and ἔπειτα; but having come to the end of the πρῶτον μέν clause, the poet unexpectedly annexes another infinitive clause, which was not in the original plan of the sentence. This new intruder, coming second in order, appropriates ἔπειτα; and when the clause, which ought to have begun with ἔπειτα δὲ, is introduced, it appears in a form independent of ὄτρυνον.

*Nem.* v. 44 ἁ Νέμεα μὲν—: l. 45 ἅλικας δ'—.

*Nem.* xi. 11 ἄνδρα δ' ἐγὼ μακαρίζω μὲν πατέρ' κ.τ.λ.: l. 13 εἰ δέ τις κ.τ.λ.

*Ol.* x. 52. The MSS. give

> παρέσταν μὲν ἄρα Μοῖραι σχεδόν,
> ὅ τ' ἐξελέγχων μόνος
> ἀλάθειαν ἐτήτυμον
> χρόνος· τὸ δὲ σαφανὲς ἰὼν πόρσω κατέφρασεν.

If we could assume the personification of χρόνος, the text might stand; τ' = παρέστα δέ. Hartung plausibly conjectured

> ὅ τ'—χρόνος τόδε σαφανὲς κ.τ.λ.

If we accept this emendation, we must go further and read ὁ δ' for ὅ τ'.

*Frag.* 75, 11 (*Dithyramb* cited by Dionysius Hal., *de comp. verb.* 22):

> 10 τὸν Βρόμιον Ἐριβόαν τε βροτοὶ καλέομεν
> γόνον ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων μελπέμεν
> γυναικῶν τε Καδμειᾶν ἔμολον.

There is little doubt that there is some corruption in these lines. In l. 11 the MSS. of Dionysius vary between μὲν, τε, and μέν τε. Usener proposed νίν τε. In l. 12 some MSS. omit τε. And in any case, even if the text, as I have given it, were certain the following line (13) is desperately corrupt, so that no conclusion could be drawn as to the consecution μέν—τε.

# APPENDIX B.

## THRASYBULUS AND THE SIXTH PYTHIAN

(with reference to *Pyth.* VI. 19 and *Isth.* II. 19).

Since Boeckh, commentators have generally assumed that Thrasybulus was the charioteer of his father on the occasion of his Pythian victory. This view was also entertained by some ancient students of Pindar as we learn in a scholium (quoted in the commentary on *Isth.* II. 19). But there is no ground for this opinion. On the contrary there is a distinct ground for believing that the horses of Xenocrates were driven at the Pythian race by the same charioteer who drove successfully at Athens, namely Nicomachus.

There are no words in the Sixth Pythian which suggest that Thrasybulus acted as charioteer. It is suggested that he had conspicuously displayed the virtue of filial obedience, which called to mind the pious self-sacrifice of Antilochus for the sake of his father Nestor; but nothing is said which need lead us to suppose that he had shewn his piety by driving his father's horses in the vale of Pytho. It is true that an allusion of this kind has been seen in *v.* 19; but I venture to think that anyone who reads the passage without prejudice will agree that such an interpretation is quite impossible.

φάει δὲ πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ
15 πατρὶ τεῷ, Θρασύβουλε, κοινάν τε γενεᾷ
λόγοισι θνατῶν
εὔδοξον ἅρματι νίκαν
Κρισαίαις ἐνὶ πτυχαῖς ἀπαγγελεῖ.
19 σύ τοι σχέθων νιν ἐπιδέξια χειρὸς ὀρθὰν
ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν κ.τ.λ.

(1) Dissen refers νιν in 19 to νίκαν and renders *tu consecutus eam dexteritate manus* (*dextre quoad manum*). This explanation of ἐπιδέξια

χειρός is most unnatural (I think, impossible); and νιν should refer to πατρί rather than to νίκαν. (2) B has νῦν for νιν, whence Bergk infers νυν and interprets *perite aurigae officio functus*, apparently taking ἐπιδέξια χειρός as it is taken by Dissen. For σχέθων he compares Homer, Ψ 466:

ἦε τὸν ἡνίοχον φύγον ἡνία οὐδὲ δυνάσθη
εὖ σχεθέειν περὶ τέρμα καὶ οὐκ ἐτύχησεν ἑλίξας.

But I am unable to see how this passage proves that σχέθειν means *aurigae officio fungi*. Moreover what is the force of νυν? It is just the word we should least expect. It would be better (3) to keep νιν and refer it to ἅρμα; so Mr Fennell, who takes ἐπιδ. χειρός 'to the right'. But it is difficult to suppose that νιν represents ἅρμα, and a past participle is distinctly required, if the words refer to the driving of Thrasybulus. (4) Mr Gildersleeve holds that νιν 'anticipates ἐφημοσύναν', the Commandment being personified.

For the phrase ἐπιδέξια (or as I should prefer to write ἐπὶ δεξιά) χειρός, we must (with Mezger) compare *Odyssey* ε 277

τὴν γὰρ [Ἄρκτον] δή μιν ἄνωγε Καλυψὼ δῖα θεάων
ποντοπορευέμεναι ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ χειρὸς ἔχοντα.

Odysseus is to keep the Bear on his left. Thus Pindar's words naturally mean, as Mezger takes them, 'having your father on your right hand'. Thrasybulus sat on his father's left hand at the epinician feast; or perhaps, as the monostrophic ode was intended to be sung during the triumphal procession, he stood beside him in the car of victory (Xenocrates 'stand neben dem Sohn beim Einzug auf dem Siegeswagen', Mezger). This is the only interpretation which does full justice to the words—σχέθων—νιν—ἐπιδέξια χειρός.

As far as the myth is concerned, the accident to Nestor's chariot—

l. 32 Νεστόρειον γὰρ ἵππος ἅρμ' ἐπέδα
Πάριος ἐκ βελέων δαϊχθείς—

would of course be appropriate if the piety of Thrasybulus had been also displayed in connexion with a chariot; but this circumstance cannot be adduced as an argument (though it might certainly be regarded as confirmatory of other evidence, if any such existed), especially as the incident may prove equally appropriate on other hypotheses (see *Introduction*).

But the only evidence we have as to the driving of the Acragantine steeds at Pytho is decidedly against the assumption that the driver was Thrasybulus. The only intelligible interpretation of *Isth.* II. 18 *sqq.*

is that Nicomachus was the charioteer on that occasion. The omission of τ' after κλειναῖς was due to some one who held the view adopted by modern editors. (See Commentary.) It may be added that, if that view were true, Pindar could hardly have omitted to mention the circumstance in this passage, seeing that the Isthmian ode is addressed especially to Thrasybulus. It would have been strange if he had celebrated Nicomachus (who is not mentioned as having won the Isthmian victory) and neglected to recall the 'skilful' driving of Thrasybulus, which he is supposed to have lauded so highly in the Pythian hymn.

No; there is no evidence that Thrasybulus was a charioteer. That he was present at the Pythian games and witnessed the victory of his father's chariot, driven by Nicomachus, we should like to believe; but there is no direct evidence even for that. There would indeed seem to be a presumption that such was the case if Mezger were right in his interpretation of πρόσωπον in l. 14 (see the passage cited above)[1]. He explains it as the face of Thrasybulus, gladdened by the tidings he brings from Pytho. It seems to me impossible that πρόσωπον here could mean 'thy face'. Thrasybulus is addressed for the first time in l. 15. Pindar would have inevitably written πατρὶ τὸ σόν or πατρὶ τεόν, if that had been his meaning. Boeckh and Dissen were quite right in referring πρόσωπον to the treasure-house of hymns mentioned in the preceding sentences. There is assuredly no ambiguity. One has only to read over the whole passage consecutively to see that πρόσωπον cannot mean anything but the front of the figurative θησαυρός.

> καὶ μὰν Ξενοκράτει
> ἑτοῖμος ὕμνων
> θησαυρὸς ἐν πολυχρύσῳ
> Ἀπολλωνίᾳ τετείχισται νάπᾳ·
> τὸν οὔτε χειμέριος ὄμβρος—
> ......οὔτ' ἄνεμος...
> ...ἄξοισι, παμφόρῳ χεράδι
> κρυπτόμενον (or τυπτόμενον). φάει δὲ πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ
> πατρὶ τεῷ κ.τ.λ.

The idea is that Xenocrates and the Eumenids will see written on the front of the musical treasure-house the proclamation of the victory.

[1] But even if Mezger's rendering were right, my hypothesis would account for the phrase.

The θησαυρὸς ὕμνων, which neither rain nor wind can sweep away, and its façade gleaming with light,—this is the most striking image in the whole ode. We have seen (cp. *Introduction*) that the first verses of the Second Isthmian refer to the hymn described under that image. The figure is changed. The songs are not compared to riches stored in a treasury, but to maidens. One is tempted, however, to fancy that the striking phrase in the later hymn ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα may be an echo of the striking phrase in the earlier, φάει πρόσωπον ἐν καθαρῷ.

# APPENDIX C.

### *Isthmian* II. 8, ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα.

In the *Classical Review* for June, 1888, Mr W. R. Paton proposes to explain this phrase by a modern custom. He writes as follows:

'We cannot conceive how gilding the faces of human merchandise can have made it more attractive to the buyer. I believe that the phrase is to be explained by a custom still prevalent in Greece and the East. At Greek open-air festivals the musician stands in the centre of the circle of dancers. Only silver coins—no paper or copper—may be given him in payment of his services. When he receives them he does not put them by, but sticks them on his face, no doubt *in order to attract further contributions.* The exertions by which he has earned them ensure their adhesion, if the weather also be fairly warm'.

If there were any proof that this custom was practised in the time of Pindar, we should certainly be justified in assuming an allusion to it, and the phrase in question would gain additional point. Mr Paton's suggestion was well worth making, but I cannot agree with him that ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα ἀοιδαί lacks significance without such an allusion. Let us suppose that Pindar personified songs as maidens, without any reference to money transactions. In that case 'silver-faced' (ἀργύρεαι πρόσωπα) would be a perfectly intelligible epithet (see Commentary). When the reference to sale comes in, ἀργύρεαι naturally and happily becomes ἀργυρωθεῖσαι, and the maidens 'with silver faces' become maidens 'with silvered faces' (suggesting ψιμύθιον, used by girls for sale). The double sense of ἄργυρος is enough for the point. But it may be readily admitted that the point would be sharper still if Mr Paton's guess were confirmed.

# APPENDIX D.

## *Isthmian* III. (A and B).

In considering the question, whether the five metrical systems in honour of Melissus of Thebes (according to my numbering III. A and III. B) form one ode or two odes, we may estimate first the external and secondly the internal evidence.

(1) The external evidence seems to be decidedly in favour of a division. (*a*) The authority of the Vatican B cannot be lightly dismissed, and it exhibits III. A and III. B (III. and IV.) as two separate poems. (*b*) The scholia support this separation. In the note on III. A (III.) 15, these words occur:
ἐν δὲ τῇ ἑξῆς ᾠδῇ καθόλου τοὺς συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ Κλεωνυμίδας κέκληκεν,
and *ib.* 18 we have

ἄμεινον δὲ εἰς τὰ ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς ᾠδῇ λεγόμενα.

In the preface to the commentary on Ode III. B (IV.)—which of course is of less weight—the identity of metre of 'the third' and 'the fourth' poems is noted (τοῦ τετάρτου εἴδους—τῷ τρίτῳ). (*c*) Against the evidence of B we have to set that of Florentine D, which recognizes only seven Isthmian hymns, III. A and III. B being joined to form a single poem (III.). The later MSS. agree with D, but they need not be taken into serious consideration. Let us assume—and the assumption is not a certain one—that the testimony of D and the testimony of B are, each by itself, equally valuable. In the present case a consideration intervenes which strikes the balance in favour of B. If there was originally a single ode, it is hard to see why it should have come into the mind of anyone to separate the first metrical system from the rest. We cannot explain the testimony of B from that of D. On the other hand, if there were originally two poems, there was a very strong temptation to throw them into one. They were written in the same

metre, they were consecutive, and they fitted well together; that was a temptation indeed. On the assumption that the testimony of B is true, it is easy to explain the false testimony of D.

Thus the evidence of the MSS. and scholia is in favour of separation.

The editio Romana, following the Vatican, recognizes the two odes to Melissus; and consequently eight Isthmian odes. The editio Aldina on the other hand gives one ode to Melissus and seven Isthmians; and this view was adopted by Boeckh in his edition and accepted by Hermann and Dissen.

(2) Setting apart the question of metre, to which I shall return, the internal evidence does not conflict with the external. The first ode (III. A) celebrates a victory which the steeds of Melissus gained at Nemea and a victory which Melissus won at Isthmus. We must observe the way in which these victories are mentioned (l. 9 *sqq.*):

> ἔστι δὲ καὶ διδύμων ἀέθλων Μελίσσῳ
> μοῖρα πρὸς εὐφροσύναν τρέψαι γλυκεῖαν
> ἦτορ, ἐν βάσσαισιν Ἰσθμοῦ δεξαμένῳ στεφάνους, τὰ δὲ κοίλᾳ λέοντος
> ἐν βαθυστέρνου νάπᾳ κάρυξε Θήβαν
> ἱπποδρομίᾳ κρατέων.

Now supposing that the second ode (I speak of the 'first' and 'second' odes for the sake of convenience, not with the intention of begging the question) had not come down to us, what conclusion should we draw from this passage as to the Isthmian victory? I venture to say, we should conclude that the Isthmian, as well as the Nemean, crown was won in a chariot-race. We should argue that if the victories had not been of the same kind, the poet must assuredly have mentioned in what particular excellence Melissus distinguished himself in the dales of Isthmus. We should say that ἱπποδρομίᾳ κρατέων, grammatically restricted to the subject of κάρυξε, logically belongs to the whole sentence, of which Melissus, although in the first clause he declines to the dative, is really the single subject.

But when we come to the second ode, while we hear nothing more of the Nemean wreath, we find that Melissus had won an Isthmian victory in the pancration. This seems to offer an argument for the unity of the odes.

For it is clear that in no case can there have been two Isthmian victories, one in the pancration, and one in the chariot-race. On the supposition that there were two distinct odes, the first (III. A) must have been the later; otherwise the Nemean victory would have been

referred to in the second (III. B). And in that case the earlier victory in the pancration would certainly have been mentioned in the later ode as well as the later victory in the chariot-race. This consideration seems to tell in support of the view that there was only one ode. For on that theory, it is clear that as the kind of the Isthmian victory is specified in the fourth antistrophos (III. B, 44) there was no need to specify it in the first (III. A, 11).

But while the theory of unity seems to make the question of the Isthmian victory clear, it involves a serious difficulty in regard to the Nemean victory. This victory, declared in III. A, 11, 12, is not referred to again throughout the ode. The Isthmian on the other hand is specially mentioned three times (III. A, 11; III. B, 20, 44), as is natural and appropriate in a hymn written especially for the occasion of an Isthmian victory. In an ordinary case, we should not look for more than a single reference to a former victory. But this is not an ordinary case; for the Nemean victory has even a more intimate relation to the argument of III. B than the Isthmian. In fact, if we had only III. B to go upon, we should certainly conclude that Melissus had never won in a *chariot-race* at any of the four great games. Yet such a victory won by Melissus was just what Pindar wanted for his argument. The Cleonymids have long been striving without success in the chariot-races at the Panhellenic games. Notwithstanding all their outlay upon horses they have never secured a victory. Now, at length, Melissus has lit them up with glory by his victory in the—chariot-race, we expect; but no; in the—pancration at the Isthmus. Surely, when III. B was written, no victory had been won at one of the great Festivals by the steeds of Melissus, any more than by those of other Cleonymids. Surely if such a victory had been won at Nemea or anywhere else, it must have been mentioned in the context of line 20 or in the neighbourhood of l. 43. It would have had too intimate a bearing on the main argument of the ode to be dismissed in l. 12 (III. A), before the argument begins[1].

It seems to me that this difficulty is a piece of internal evidence which tells against the original unity of the two poems. On the other hand, if we separate the poems we are met by other difficulties. In the first place (1) there is the point, already dwelt on, as to the indefinite mention of an Isthmian victory in III. A, 11, which, in an

[1] We can hardly follow Perthes in seeing an allusion to the Nemean victory in the mention of Poseidon who dwelt at Onchestus and at Isthmus (III. B, l. 19), on the ground that both these places were renowned for horse and chariot races.

independent hymn, would imply a victory in a chariot contest. Then (2) there is the odd circumstance that the metres of both odes are identical. There is no other instance of such identity in Pindar's epinicians. There is also (3) the fact that some similar ideas and similar expressions occur in both III. A and III. B; and in particular there is a responsion, emphasised by Mezger as an argument for unity, in the first line of the epode of III. A and the first line of the first epode of III. B:

III. A, 13 *ἱπποδρομίᾳ κρατέων· ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετάν.*
III. B, 13 *καὶ μηκέτι μακροτέραν σπεύδειν ἀρετάν.*

If we hold that the two poems were originally distinct, we are bound to take account of and explain all these facts.

The truth seems to be that those who maintain the unity and those who believe in the distinction of the two odes to Melissus are both to a certain extent right. The poems belong together, and yet were originally distinct. This is the view which I have adopted in my Introduction and indicated by the numbering (III. A and B). It appears to me to explain the data satisfactorily, and to reconcile the difficulties which meet those who hold either of the extreme views.

We may advance to this conclusion thus: (1) As the assumption of the original unity of the two poems involves considerable difficulties (external and internal), which cannot be solved, we must start with the negative assumption that the poems were not a single ode composed for a pancration victory. (2) On this hypothesis, it is clear that III. A is later than III. B, inasmuch as there is no reference in the latter to the Nemean victory mentioned in the former. (3) The metrical identity of the two compositions shews that there was some special relation between them. It was not Pindar's habit to compose in the same metre merely because he was composing for the same victor. The first Olympian, and the first three Pythians, all in honour of Hiero, are all metrically distinct. (4) The only conceivable reason for this repetition of metrical structure is that both poems were meant to be sung together. In other words III. A was an enlargement of the original poem III. B. Instead of composing an independent hymn in honour of the Nemean victory which Melissus won, perhaps soon, after the Isthmian, Pindar chose to add a new system to the Isthmian ode. And thus the Nemean and Isthmian victories could be sung together in a long hymn of five systems. We can imagine that Melissus, rich as he doubtless was, might not have been disposed to incur the expense of a new ode of four systems; especially if the victories

followed hard one on the other. The plan which was adopted economised the labour of the poet and the purse of the victor, while a composition of noble measure was supplied to the chorus which sang at the epinician festival.

The question whether the new system was intended as a postscript or a preface to the original poem can be easily decided. It is clearly a proeme. For l. 18 (III. A) need not form the ending of a hymn (though it must be admitted that as an ending it would be by no means unsuitable); whereas the formal conclusion, with the reference to Orseas the trainer, in l. 72 (III. B), does not admit of any continuation. The fact that so many have believed in the unity of the hymn, thus arranged, shews the dexterity of Pindar in fitting the new system to the old ode. It is only on close inspection, with discernment like Mr Fennell's, that we can detect the seam in the context of the work. The echoes of language which abound in the proeme have been pointed out in the Introduction. Pindar saw that the most effectual way of working the new matter into the unity of the ode would be to sound in advance some of the most striking notes of the poem. Yet he constructed the prelude in such a way that it could be sung, if there were need, by itself, independently of the Isthmian ode. And tradition preserved in successive MSS. the distinction between the original work and the addition that was afterwards made to it.

The view, for which I contend, was first put forward in its main features by Bulle in 1869/71. Without any knowledge of Bulle's papers[1] (though I might have learned about them in Mezger), I came to similar conclusions and stated them in *Hermathena* (1890). The arguments of Perthes[2] and Mezger against the view of Bulle do not appear to me to be cogent. The responsion of ἀρετάν, on which Mezger relied as a strong proof of unity, is equally in harmony with the theory which I have ventured to adopt. And as for the objection urged by Friederichs that the first lines of III. B could not have formed the beginning of a Pindaric ode, I cannot agree with him. The openings of the Epinician hymns exhibit every possible variety. The Ninth and Tenth Olympians, the Ninth Pythian, and the Seventh Isthmian, introduce the victor's name in the first lines, just in the same way as here; and the circumstance that elsewhere Pindar uses the

[1] In a *Programm* (Bremen) 1869, and in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher*, 1871 (585—589).

[2] In a *Programm* (Treptow) 1871, and in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher*, 1872 (217—226).

figure of a road (κέλευθος) in the middle of a hymn does not prove that he might not have also used it at the beginning.

Mr Fennell acutely recognized that the juncture between III. A and III. B was not what we should expect. He saw that something was wanting to the unity of the ode, though the want may not be evident to a superficial reader. At the same time he felt the difficulties which attend the theory that the two odes are quite independent. Accordingly he resorted to the conjecture that a system was lost between III. A and III. B, the ode having originally had five systems. The hypothesis of such a loss seems very hazardous; and the serious difficulties which tell against the unity are not solved. But Mr Fennell's conviction that there is a certain hitch in the context has considerable importance for the view which I have been maintaining. It is thoroughly in accordance with the supposition that III. A was an afterthought. Pindar, with all his art, could not absolutely hide the marks of the joining. How great was his skill is proved by the number of editors who have accepted the unity without a qualm. And it is even probable that Mr Fennell and the others who discerned that there was something odd would have suspected nothing if the tradition of the two independent hymns had not opened their eyes.

# APPENDIX E.

## Dates of *Isthmians* IV. and V.

The order of the three odes written for the sons of Lampon is perfectly clear. The Fifth Nemean contains no mention of the Isthmian victories of Phylacidas; while the Fifth Isthmian refers explicitly to the Fifth Nemean. And when the Fifth Isthmian was written, the Nemean and the second Isthmian victory of Phylacidas had not yet been won. The order of the odes lies on their surface; the chronology is not so clear.

The only basis for determining their respective dates is the reference to the Battle of Salamis in the last of the three. When *Isthmian* IV. was written, that event must have been recent. καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἄρει μαρτυρῆσαι κεν πόλις Αἴαντος κ.τ.λ. can hardly have been written more than a year or two after the battle; it might well have been written in the same year. Mezger argues that this passage could hardly have been written after the Battle of Plataea, in which Thebes took the Persian side; especially in view of the statement of Pausanias (III. 4, 7) that Lampon distinguished himself by his ardour in that conflict. In that case he thinks that Pindar 'würde sich über den Krieg gewiss anders geäussert oder vielmehr auf den Aegineten gar kein Gedicht verfertigt haben'. This argument is not conclusive. It would be rash to lay down that the hymn cannot date from 479 or even (though this is unlikely; see below p. 175) from 478. Yet it seems not improbable that 480 is the true year. Let us take the three alternatives in order.

(1) If *Isthmian* IV. was composed at the end of 480—for the Battle of Salamis was fought in autumn—, the Isthmian victory which it celebrates must have been won in spring 480; and the Nemean victory, which it also celebrates, was probably won at the Nemean

games held in the preceding year, 481.—In that case, the latest possible date for *Isth.* v., and the first Isthmian victory of Phylacidas, is 482. I have shewn in the Introduction to *Isth.* iv. that Phylacidas almost certainly competed and failed at an Olympian contest. According to this calculation, his failure at Olympia must fall in 480, at those games which were held about the time of the battles of Thermopylae and Artemisium. This result harmonizes with the circumstance that the ode in honour of a victory won in the spring was not composed till the end of the year. Phylacidas hoped for an Olympian crown and an Olympian hymn. Failing to secure these, he fell back on the next best. Pindar was not called upon to sing the victory at Isthmus until it was found that he was not destined to sing a victory on the Alpheus.

This reckoning is of course hypothetical; and other assumptions are possible. For example, the first Isthmian victory might have been gained in 484, and the Olympian disappointment might have fallen in the same year. The Nemean victory of Phylacidas might have been won either in 483 or in 481, and the second Isthmian in 480. But this is less likely. The presumption is that, if the crown at Nemea had been won *after* the failure at Olympia, Pindar would then and there have been required to pour the third libation to Zeus Sôtêr.

As for the date of the Fifth Nemean, it is of course out of the question to attempt to do more than determine a nearer limit. And even this is hardly possible, as we cannot be quite certain that Phylacidas was the younger of the two brothers. If he was the younger—as has always been assumed, and as is highly probable—, we can easily fix a limit. Let us suppose that the difference in age was only one year. Phylacidas was a man when he won his first victory, which, as we have seen, cannot be placed later than 482. Pytheas was only a boy when he won his crown of selinon at Nemea. If Pytheas was barely young enough to compete as a boy at Nemea, and if Phylacidas was barely old enough not to be eligible in the boys' pancration at the Isthmus—the two extreme cases—, it is clear that an interval of two years must be allowed between the two victories. But as 484 was not a Nemean year, the latest possible date for *Nemean* v. is 485. This is the limit. But as *Nem.* v. 6 rather suggests that Pytheas was not hazardously close to the age when he would no longer count as a παῖς, and as it is hardly likely that Phylacidas was barely 'out of his teens' when he conquered all comers in the men's pancration, we may conclude that at least five years elapsed between *Nemean* v. and *Isthmian* v.; and that if the latter was composed in 482 the former was not later than 487.

This argument rests on the hypothesis that Phylacidas was the younger brother. This is an inference drawn from no positive evidence, and chiefly resting, as far as I can discover, on the circumstance that Phylacidas is not mentioned in the ode to Pytheas. Clearly such an inference is invalid. If Pytheas were the younger there is no reason that he might not have distinguished himself as a boy at an earlier date than when his elder brother Phylacidas won athletic successes as a man. And if so, there was no occasion for any reference to Phylacidas, as yet undistinguished, in the Nemean hymn. Nor does the passage in *Isth.* IV. (59 *sqq.*), *αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις κ.τ.λ.*, prove anything. It has been interpreted to mean, that Pytheas 'coached' Phylacidas,—this naturally implying the seniority of Pytheas. But this view is erroneous; see commentary.

I am inclined to agree with the general belief that Pytheas was the elder; but am compelled to own that I cannot regard it as absolutely certain.

(2) If, as Mr Fennell thinks, *Isth.* IV. was written in 479, after a Nemean victory won by Phylacidas in that year, our conclusions remain the same as far as the two Isthmian victories, the failure at Olympia, and the Nemean victory of Pytheas, are concerned.

(3) If the second Isthmian victory fell in 478, the Nemean might have fallen in 479, and the first Isthmian in 480 (the competition at Olympia falling in the same year). In this case the limit for *Nemean* V. (assuming the juniority of Phylacidas) would be 483; (assuming his seniority) 481. But against this theory it must be taken into account that the Isthmian victory in the pancration in 478 was probably won by Cleander of Aegina, who is celebrated in the Seventh Isthmian.

# APPENDIX F.

## ἀρετά. *Isth.* IV. 17.

In view of some passages (Pindar *Nem.* x. 2 and v. 53, *Isth.* IV. 17, Sophocles, *Philoct.* 1420, Plato, *Sympos.* 208 D), where ἀρετή cannot be explained in its ordinary sense but seems to mean 'reward' (of excellence), I put forward a conjecture as to the origin of this use in my *Nemeans*, *Appendix* A, *note* 9. I now believe that this conjecture is inadequate and unreservedly retract it. ἀρετή, *reward* or *pay*, cannot be derived, as a secondary meaning, from ἀρετή, *virtus*.

In the three Pindaric passages mentioned above, the explanation of ἀρετά by 'reputation for excellence' is too harsh to be accepted. It is true that ἀρετή sometimes seems to bear the meaning which Plutarch ascribes to it in his essay *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat* (c. 6): ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡ ἀρετὴ δόξας περιποιεῖ, παρὰ τοῦτο ποιοῦνται τὴν εὐδοξίαν ἀρετὴν ὀνομάζοντες. Yet in Thucydides I. 33, for example (φέρουσα ἐς μὲν τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀρετήν), ἀρετήν is not simply equivalent to εὐδοξίαν, but means 'the name ἀρετή'. So too in Eur. *Med.* 629, where it stands under the shadow of εὐδοξίαν; and cp. *Odyssey* ξ 402, where it is joined with εὐκλείαν.

It seems possible that there were two words ἀρετή which we should distinguish.

(1) ἀρετή = nṛtấ (cp. Sanskrit *sû-nṛ́tâ*), connected with ἀδροτής, ἀνήρ, ἠνορέη, ἀρείων &c.; *manlihood.*

(2) ἀρετή (τιμή), *compensation, fee*; from ἄρνυμαι, ἀρέσαι, ἀρέσσομαι. Compare middle (to receive or win a τιμή),

A 159 τιμὴν ἀρνύμενοι Μενελάῳ,

E 552 τιμὴν Ἀτρείδῃς—ἀρνυμένω,

Z 446 ἀρνύμενος κλέος,

X 160 ἀρνύσθην (ἀέθλια),

α 5 ἀρνύμενος ἥν τε ψυχὴν καὶ νόστον ἑταίρων,

and active,

I 120 ἂψ ἐθέλω ἀρέσαι δόμεναί τ' ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα

(*to compensate*), cp. T 138. So in middle, of a *mutual* transaction, Z 526 and also, in the sense of the active, with accusative as I 112 μιν ἀρεσσάμενοι.—For the forms ἄρνυμαι: ἀρέσαι: ἀρετή compare στόρνυμι: (στορέννυμι): στορέσω: ἀκόρετος.

# APPENDIX G.

## *Isth.* IV. 59.

αἰνέω καὶ Πυθέαν ἐν γυιοδάμαις
Φυλακίδᾳ πλαγᾶν δρόμον εὐθυπορῆσαι
χερσὶ δεξιὸν νόῳ ἀντίπαλον.

The usual way of taking the words is that of Hermann and Dissen. The latter translates: *laudo etiam Pytheam membrorum domitoribus in brachiis Phylacidae plagarum cursum recta praeivisse, dextrum peritia adversarium.* So Mezger, taking Φυλακίδᾳ more strictly as *dativus commodi.* According to this explanation, χερσὶ is taken with γυιοδάμαις (from γυιόδαμος), and we should have, as Mr Fennell remarks, 'the most flagrant violation of usual order to be found in Pindar'. But those who demur to admitting this violent dislocation of adjective and substantive seem decided that we have here a part of γυιόδαμος, and not, as the scholiast thought, a part of γυιοδάμας. Mommsen alone approves of the view of the scholiast; but Hartung reads πλαγαῖς and Mr Fennell accepts it. The general meaning is the same, χερσί being taken with δεξιόν.

Mr Fennell however goes further. He is of opinion that οἱ in l. 62 ought to refer to Phylacidas, whereas with the usual reading it must refer to Pytheas, the subject of the preceding sentence, and the ἀντίπαλον. He therefore takes Φυλακίδαν from the Florentine MS. and reads Πυθέᾳ instead of Πυθέαν, rendering 'I declare in praise of Pytheas too that Phylakidas kept on a straight course amid crushing blows, an antagonist skilled in fight by-reason-of-his-intelligence'.

Against all these interpretations it may be urged that they attribute to αἰνέω with infinitive a meaning which neither it nor its compound ἐπαινέω, in that construction, bears elsewhere. If εὐθυπορῆσαι depends on αἰνέω, it can only mean 'I recommend Pytheas to hold a straight course'. To express 'I praise Pytheas for having held &c.' we should require αἰνέω εὐθυπορήσαντα.

## APPENDIX H.

### THE PREPOSITION ἀνά

(with reference to Isth. VI. 33; also I. 9; II. 27; IV. 22; VII. 68).

In order to understand the signification of ἀνά with the accusative in Pindar, we must carefully examine its usage in Homer and attempt to define the limits which mark it off from other prepositions, especially from κατά. κατά was originally the conjugate of ἀνά, but it often appears to collide and sometimes almost coincides with it[1]. It is important to determine the difference between ἀνὰ μέγαρον and κατὰ μέγαρον, ἀνὰ ἄστυ and κατὰ ἄστυ, ἀνὰ νῆσον and κατὰ νῆσον, ἀν' ὅμιλον and καθ' ὅμιλον &c.; and, in the first place, with verbs of motion.

The result, to which an examination of all the instances in the Iliad and Odyssey leads, may be formulated thus:

ἀνά *with the accusative expresses motion through or in a space; and implies method, or some definite aim governing the direction of the motion. For example, the guiding motive might be to reach the further side of the space indicated, or to traverse the whole space exhaustively.*

κατά *with the accusative also expresses motion through or in a space; but the motion is not defined as continuous or methodical.*

Thus in describing the progress of heralds bent on business (Γ 245,

[1] In a few instances in Homer ἀνά has its original form of *upward* motion. Π 349 ἀνὰ στόμα καὶ κατὰ ῥῖνας (a good example of the conjugate relation of ἀνά and κατά). Χ 452, Β 250, ε 456, χ 18, ω 318. With ἀναβαίνω, ἀναίσσω, χ 132, 143, 239. κιόν' ἀν' ὑψηλὴν ἐρύσαι χ 176, 193. ἀνὰ νῶτα θέουσα of a vein (Ν 547). In γ 492, ο 145, 190 ἀνά θ' ἅρματ' ἔβαινον may be taken as tmesis. In Κ 466 ὑψόσ' ἀείρας θῆκεν ἀνὰ μυρίκην, the accus. is determined by ἀείρας; contrast Θ 441 ἅρματα δ' ἀμ βωμοῖσι τίθει, where the dative is in place.

No instances of ἀνά in this sense are found in Pindar, though he has ἀνά with the dative in the corresponding sense of rest *upon* (as ἀνὰ σκάπτῳ, like Homeric ἀνὰ σκήπτρῳ; ἀνὰ βωμῷ, ἀν' ἵπποις &c.). Mr Monro is mistaken in stating (in his Homeric Grammar) that ἀνά with dat. is only found in Homer.

H 183, 186, Θ 517, υ 276); or a marriage procession (λ 539); or the solemn progress of a king (η 72, θ 173) through a city, ἀνὰ ἄστυ is the expression. Whereas κατὰ ἄστυ is used of walking in the streets unofficially, irresponsibly, or without the suggestion of method or goal. If we were rendering into the Greek of Homer, 'led in triumph through the streets of Rome', we should have to use ἀνὰ ἄστυ; but *flâner les rues* would require κατὰ ἄστυ[1]. A beggar wandering about the town for alms would be said πτωχεύειν κατὰ ἄστυ[2]; but a beggar going his regular rounds, visiting house after house methodically throughout his district, would be said πτωχεύειν ἀνὰ ἄστυ (τ 73, 273). When a god, having appeared to a mortal in an island, departs to Olympus, he goes ἀνὰ νῆσον; but when Odysseus and his companions wander about exploring the island of the Cyclops, the preposition is κατά[3]. ἀνά is used when an object or a direction determines the course[4] (as in κ 275, where Odysseus is making ἀνὰ βήσσας for the home of Circe; and in ξ 2 where he follows the direction pointed out by Athena). κατά is used of grasshoppers singing (Γ 151) or of hunters hunting (ι 120), or a wild beast moving (K 184) through a wood; of flies flitting about in a sheep-fold (B 470) or of a lion prowling (E 140), of animals feeding in a place (E 162, Υ 221); of the movements of Artemis revelling along mountain heights (ζ 103), of the wild course of the mad Lycurgus (Z 133), or of a fish leaping in a wave (Φ 126). When the beans fly about the threshing-floor, it is κατ' ἀλωήν (N 588); the hunting and slaying of beasts *here and there* in the mountains is κατ' οὔρεα (Φ 485).

When Diomede rushes over the plain on his terrible course, ποταμῷ πλήθοντι ἐοικώς, the expression ἀμ πεδίον (E 87, 96) indicates that there was method—for the Trojans only too much method—in his fury. His course was onward and inevitable like a river; καπ πεδίον would express that he was now here, now there[5]. The river-god bids Achilles, πεδίον κάτα μέρμερα ῥέζε; that is, *anywhere* in the plain, as opposed to the river[6]. In Z 71, ἀνά signifies a methodical spoiling of the dead. In Ψ 464 ἀμ πεδίον means that the search of the eyes, as they range over the plain, is exhaustive; on the other hand καθ' ἑὸν δόμον (χ 381)

[1] Compare κατά, E 495, Z 104, Λ 212, β 383, ο 311, ρ 246, ω 413, ρ 501, τ 67, I 463 &c. This distinction was rightly drawn by Hermann.

[2] ρ 18, σ 1, υ 178, ρ 566.

[3] Contrast κ 308, μ 143 with ι 153.

[4] Compare μ 308, κ 251.

[5] Cp. ω 449. So too the strong onward sweep of the north wind over the ground is brought out by ἀμ πεδίον (ε 329, 330); the thistles are borne straight on in its course; whereas of a wind strewing chaff about a threshing-floor, we have κατ' ἀλωάς, E 499.

[6] Φ 217, cp. Π 96.

does not suggest a thorough-going search. In describing flights, panics, &c. κατά is the right word, not ἀνά[1]. On the other hand when troops are marshalled, the place is indicated by ἀνά[2]. But of troops involuntarily gathered in the city (by the pursuit of an enemy), κατὰ ἄστυ is found[3].

To collect people here and there in Achaia is κατ' Ἀχαιίδα[4]; whereas ἀνὰ δῆμον in β 291 implies an exhaustive search throughout the dêmos for all the volunteers who could be got. In Z 287 κατὰ ἄστυ means that old women are collected here and there in the city (not, all the old women throughout the city, which would be ἀνὰ ἄστυ); and in I 329 κατὰ Τροίην means that the eleven cities were in various parts of the land of Troia.

In regard to the regular course of the ploughman through the field, along the straight furrows, we expect ἀνά and find it (ν 32 νειὸν ἀν', cp. Σ 546). But of mowers in different parts of a cornfield, we find κατ' ἄρουραν (Λ 68).

When the shade of Achilles stalks away after the meeting with Odysseus, it is not suggested that it makes for any particular point or that its steps are guided by an object. The expression is φοίτα κατὰ λειμῶνα (λ 539). So too κατὰ λειμῶνα (λ 573) of Orion collecting beasts, which he had slain, *here and there* in the meadow, wherever he found them. But when Atreides marches through the host searching for Alexander, it is ἀν' ὅμιλον ἐφοίτα (Γ 449)[5].

The sphere of violent, or hasty, or involuntary movements is marked by κατά[6], as in the case of panics noted above. To move about promiscuously in the hall is κατὰ μέγαρον, but the cup-bearer, who goes regularly from table to table ἐπισταδόν, proceeds ἀνὰ μέγαρον[7]. When a bow is carried deliberately from one place to another, it is ἀνὰ δῶμα[8]. Eumaeus hastens ἀνὰ πρόθυρον for the purpose of calling away the dogs; and Melanthius is led to his execution ἀνὰ πρόθυρόν τε καὶ αὐλήν[9]. When a man is described as coming or going through the house, without the suggestion of any particular errand, we find κατὰ δῶμα[10]. The bronze speeds on its fatal errand ἀν' ὀδόντας in E 74.

κατά is quite in place of a child strolling *about* a garden with his

[1] Λ 172, 167, Φ 14, 25, χ 299, α 116, υ 225.

[2] Θ 55; so ἀνὰ μάχην E 254. In Π 156 ἀνὰ κλισίας = throughout the camp, where κατά might also be used, but not in the sense which is under discussion. It would be distributive, 'according to the tents'; not 'here and there among the tents'.

[3] Σ 286, Φ 225, Ω 662.

[4] Λ 770, 716.

[5] Cp. E 528.

[6] π 109, υ 319, χ 23, 307, 360.

[7] η 180, ν 51.

[8] φ 234, 378.

[9] χ 474, and ξ 34.

[10] δ 7, ρ 329.

father (ω 338), or of a shepherd keeping his flock νομὸν κάτα (ι 217). No purpose is attributed to a cloud when it spreads over the sea (Δ 276, 278); and a ship driven by random winds wanders κατὰ πόντον (δ 510, ε 377). So too κατά is used of a vessel, though on its due course, leaping from wave to wave[1]; the point being that it is now here, now there. We must carefully distinguish the use of this preposition in λ 639 κατ' ὠκεανὸν ποταμὸν φέρε where it has its original meaning of *down* (stream; as in κατὰ ῥόον).

The results of this induction may now be brought to bear on one or two passages, which in themselves could not be decisive, as the circumstances do not define the meaning. When lions are described as carrying a goat ἀνὰ ῥωπήια (N 199), the suggestion seems to be that they are shaping their course towards their den[2]. In ο 80 Menelaus proposes to Telemachus τραφθῆναι ἀν' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος. In the light of our investigation we see that this means 'to make the tour of' Greece; whereas καθ' Ἑλλάδα would mean to wander here and there in Greece,—visit parts of it at random. In σεύατ' ἀνὰ ἄστυ Z 505 it is implied that Paris has a purpose. In ρ 418

ἐγὼ δέ κέ σε κλείω κατ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν

the speaker undertakes to spread the κλέος, not throughout the world methodically, but in many and sundry places according as he may find opportunity. So in χ 377 κατὰ δῶμα (πονήσομαι) means here and there in the house; not suggesting (though not excluding) method or thoroughness.

Thus κατά is used when the action is confined to a certain space, but (1) a point of operation is not fixed (if it were, ἐν would be required) and (2) the space is not conceived as traversed in any fixed direction (else ἀνά). It will be easily understood that in many cases the same phenomenon might be described by either ἀνά or κατά, according to the point of view. A spectator, who beheld Agamemnon hurrying through the host, but did not know that his steps were guided by a definite aim, might describe what he saw in the words καθ' ὅμιλον ἐφοίτα. But the poet who is initiated into the counsels of the king and is concerned with the object of his progress, says ἀν' ὅμιλον.

This is excellently illustrated by a comparison of ν 367 with χ 180. In the former passage Athena is seeking in a cave for a safe place to hide the treasures which Odysseus has brought home from Phaeacia. μαιομένη κευθμῶνας ἀνὰ σπέος brings out the methodical manner of her

[1] A 483, β 429.

[2] Perhaps we may explain K 362 in the same way, but it is to be observed that this passage occurs in the Doloneia.

search. But in the second passage, which deals with Melanthius searching for arms in the storehouse, we find

ἤτοι ὁ μὲν θαλάμοιο μυχὸν κάτα τεύχε' ἐρεύνα,

not ἀνὰ μυχόν as we might expect. But the reason is perfectly clear. In the first case the poet's concern is with the safe stowing away of the treasures. But in the second case, the search for the arms is subsidiary. The main point is that Melanthius is somewhere in the room; and that the oxherd and the swineherd lie in wait for him at the door (τὼ δ' ἔσταν ἑκάτερθε). What the goatherd was doing inside,—whether his search was thorough or not—is for the immediate purpose entirely subordinate. Hence κατά is quite in place.

If we apply this principle to χ 484

πάσας δ' ὄτρυνον δμωὰς κατὰ δῶμα νέεσθαι

(where κατὰ δῶμα is not to be taken with νέεσθαι, as Ebeling takes it), it appears that if this meant 'bid throughout the house (i.e. go through the house bidding) all the maids to come', ἀνὰ δῶμα would be required. πάσας is emphatic. It follows that κατὰ δῶμα is to be taken closely with δμωάς, 'the maids in the palace', as distinguished from the servants of Odysseus in the country farms; and thus it is practically identical with ἐν μεγάροισι, which occurs elsewhere in a like connexion.

It would be tedious to enumerate further instances of ἀνά with verbs of motion. Enough has been said to shew the idea which is attached to it; and to enable us to apply this in those cases where it is not joined with a verb signifying motion. We can discern, for example, a shade of difference between ἀνὰ δῆμον ἄριστοι and κατὰ δῆμον, though the phrases ultimately amount to the same thing. The former implies that the best men are singled out by a methodical search throughout the dêmos. The latter means 'the best anywhere to be found in the dêmos'. The difference will be clearer if we substitute ἀγαθοί for ἄριστοι. It is manifest that ἀγαθοὶ κατὰ δῆμον is a correct expression, 'good men anywhere in the district'; but with ἀνὰ δῆμον ἀγαθοὶ would be equivalent to οἱ ἀγαθοί. In Ω 166 θυγατέρες δ' ἀνὰ δώματ' ἰδὲ νυοὶ ὠδύροντο suggests that all the daughters, both by blood and by marriage, were mourning; but there is no such suggestion of universality in Ω 512 στοναχὴ κατὰ δώματ' ὀρώρει. In fact ἀνά, even with verbs of rest, implies a motion in the imagination, a sweep of the mind over the whole space indicated. If we were speaking of certain gods as known 'through all the bounds of Doric land', we should have to say ἀνὰ γαῖαν. Here the suggestion of motion is evident. But it is also implied in such a phrase as τί κλέος ἐστ' ἀνὰ ἄστυ; the speaker suggests a mental

range over the whole city in search of news. *τί κλέος ἐστὶ κατ' ἄστυ;* is good Greek, but does not make this suggestion. On the other hand, *κλέος τι ἀνὰ ἄστυ;* would not stand: *κλέος τι κατ' ἄστυ;* would be right.

We are now in a position to consider the instances of *ἀνά* with the accusative in Pindar.

1. *Pyth.* II. 60 *εἰ δέ τις—λέγει ἕτερόν τιν' ἀν' Ἑλλάδα τῶν πάροιθε γενέσθαι ὑπέρτερον.* Here there is the mental sweep over the whole of Hellas. *ἀνά* is stronger than either *κατά* or *ἐν.*

2. *Pyth.* XI. 52 *τῶν γὰρ ἀνὰ πόλιν εὑρίσκων τὰ μέσα μακροτέρῳ ὄλβῳ τεθαλότα.* *ἀνά* is appropriate to the idea of searching suggested by *εὑρίσκων.*

3. *Nem.* VIII. 12 *οἵ τ' ἀνὰ Σπάρταν Πελοπηιάδαι.* Observe the article: all the Pelopids to be found in Sparta. Perhaps the contrast of *ἐν Ἀθάναισιν* (l. 11) and *ἀνὰ Σπάρταν* (*ἐν Σπάρτᾳ* would have been sufficient for the general sense) is intended to suggest the difference between the compact city of Athens and the straggling group of villages which constituted Sparta—*κατὰ κώμας οἰκισθεῖσα.*

4. *Nem.* IX. 35 *Χρομίῳ κεν ὑπασπίζων...ἔκρινας ἂν κίνδυνον ὀξείας ἀυτᾶς, οὕνεκεν κ.τ.λ.* This combination is formed on the model of such Homeric phrases as *ἄν τε μάχην καὶ ἀνὰ κλόνον* (E 167), *ἂμ πόνον* (N 239), *ἀν' ἰωχμόν* (Θ 89). *ὀξεῖα ἀυτή* is Homeric (O 312), though not found with *ἀνά.* The phrase suggests the warrior ranging throughout the whole space where the battle was hottest and the jeopardy greatest (but perhaps it suggests time also,—while the battle lasted. Cp. *ἀνὰ νύκτα,* Ξ 80). In like manner,

5. *Isth.* VI. 35 *ἀπέπνευσας ἁλικίαν προμάχων ἀν' ὅμιλον* echoes two Homeric phrases, *ἀν' ὅμιλον* (often) and *ἀνὰ προμάχους* (N 760). These phrases occur with verbs signifying motion directly or indirectly (such as *φοιτᾶν, μάχομαι,* &c.); and in this Pindaric passage one would certainly expect *καθ' ὅμιλον,* as at the instant of the warrior's death, marked by *ἀπέπνευσας,* our attention is confined to a single spot somewhere in the front rank. But *ἀνά* forces our imagination to range over the whole *προμάχων ὅμιλος.* In order to bring out this effect, we must, as we have no corresponding preposition in English, change the form of the sentence. We might render: 'the front rank of the battle *was the scene of* thy death'. In fact the force of *ἀνά* is to call up the scene, and Pindar employs this nuance elsewhere in other contexts. For example in

6. *Isth.* VII. 68 ὃς Ἴσθμιον ἀν νάπος Δωρίων ἔλαχεν σελίνων, the surroundings of the victor, the huzzas of the spectators at the great Isthmian panegyris, the whole festive scene of which he was the centre when the wreath was placed upon his brow, are suggested by ἀν. Similarly in

7. *Nem.* VI. 41 (Ποσειδάνιον ἀν τέμενος) the 'precincts of Poseidon', are the stage where Creontidas was the observed of the observers.

8. *Isth.* II. 27 ὄντε καὶ κάρυκες Ἀλεῖοι—ἀσπάζοντο—χρυσέας ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας, γαῖαν ἀνὰ σφετέραν, is another example of this use of ἀνά to mark the scene of a great event.

9. *Nem.* VII. 82 βασιλῆα δὲ θεῶν πρέπει δάπεδον ἀν τόδε γαρυέμεν, is somewhat different. The floor is the scene of the celebration, but the movements of the chorus may be supposed to range over the whole space. Compare Euripides *Or.* 330 and Aristophanes *Birds* 1265

μηδέ τιν' ἱερόθυτον ἀνὰ δάπεδον ἔτι
τῇδε βροτῶν θεοῖσι πέμπειν καπνόν—

and *Frogs* 326

τόνδ' ἀνὰ λειμῶνα χορεύσων.

Cp. also Eurip. *Phoen.* 348 and *Hipp.* 336, 338.

10. *Frag.* 172

οὐ Πηλέος ἀντιθέου μόχθοις νεότας ἐνέλαμψεν μυρίοις;
πρῶτον μὲν Ἀλκμήνας σὺν υἱῷ Τρώϊον ἀμ πεδίον
καὶ μετὰ ζωστῆρας Ἀμαζόνος ἦλθεν.

Here we must supply, from ἦλθεν, a verb of slightly different meaning in l. 2. We may render; 'with Alcmena's son he *appeared on* the Trojan plain, and went in quest of &c.' The Trojan plain was the scene of the brightness of his rising.

11. *Frag.* 107 ἢ πόντου κενέωσιν ἀνὰ (Scaliger's correction for ἀλλά, but I should prefer ἀμ; ΛΛ was read for Μ) πέδον. Here ἀνά is used in its normal sense of motion all over a surface.

12. *Isth.* IV. 22 τέτραπται θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἀν καθαράν. It seems possible that in this place ἀνά may have its original force of *up*. ἀν' ὁδόν occurs twice in Homer: K 339 βῆ ῥ' ἀν' ὁδὸν μεμαώς (of Dolon going to the ships), and ψ 136 ἀν' ὁδὸν στείχων. But καθ' ὁδόν is more usual both in Homer (O 682, θ 444, ρ 204, κατὰ ὦλκα N 707, κατ' ἀμαξιτόν X 146, κατὰ κέλευθα υ 64, ω 10, κατ' ἀταρπόν P 743, κατ' ἀγυιάς Z 391), and in Pindar: καθ' ὁδόν *fr.* 30, 4, *Nem.* II. 7, κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν *Nem.* IX. 19, κατ' ἀγυιάς *fr.* 194, 5, κατ' ἀμαξιτόν *Pyth.* IV. 247, κατ' ἀμευσίπορον τρίοδον *Pyth.* XI. 38. Thus καθ' ὁδόν is the regular idiom

for *on the way*, or *along the road*. It is clear that ἀνὰ κέλευθον is stronger, and we are reminded of the Homeric expression, already discussed, τραφθῆναι ἀν' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος. Thus κέλευθον ἀν καθαράν means *along an undefiled path, all the way*. Yet we must at the same time admit that ἀν may here suggest that the path is an upward one.

In *Pyth.* XI. 56 the MSS. have ἀν' ἐσχατιάν, which is manifestly corrupt. In two passages Bergk has introduced ἀνά where it is not found in the MSS.: (1) *Nem.* X. 41, he reads νικαφορίαις γὰρ ὅσαις Προίτοιό τ' ἀν' ἱπποτρόφον ἄστυ θάλησαν κ.τ.λ. This conjecture is highly improbable (see my note *ad versum*), but is in accordance with Pindar's use of ἀνά as illustrated above under 6, 7 &c. (2) *Isth.* VI. 33 ἀν' Ἀμφιάρειον, which would imply that Strepsiades was slain in the τέμενος of Amphiaraus or was carried thither to die. But ἀνά here is clearly improbable, as προμάχων ἀν' ὅμιλον which follows almost excludes another ἀνά, nor is it likely that the ὅμιλος προμάχων was actually fighting inside the τέμενος.

In *Isth.* I. 9 I have proposed to read ἀνά, in a sense strictly the same as that explained above under 6, 7.

It remains to notice two cases in which ἀνά with the accusative has a temporal force.

13. *Nem.* III. 49 ὅλον ἀν χρόνον presents no difficulty as it is exactly parallel to the local sense of ἀνά.

14. *Ol.* IX. 85 ἀμφότεροι κράτησαν μίαν ἔργον ἀν ἁμέραν. *uno die* is not an accurate rendering; for that would be μιᾷ ἐν ἁμέρᾳ (see *Isth.* III. B 16). It seems to me that the phrase μίαν ἀν ἁμέραν is closely parallel to Ἴσθμιον ἀν νάπος (see 6 above). We may perhaps bring out the point by rendering, *the same day witnessed the victory of both;* or *in the course of the same day both*, &c.

# APPENDIX I.

## THE BATTLES OF SALAMIS AND HIMERA IN PINDAR

(with reference to *Isth.* IV. 4 *sqq.*).

In one of the greatest odes in which he celebrates Hiero, Pindar has linked together in memorable verses the two great deliverances of Hellas from her barbarian invaders, wrought about the same time—men loved to imagine, on the very same day—in the east at Salamis, and in the west at Himera.

> ἀρέομαι
> πὰρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθαναίων χάριν
> μισθόν, ἐν Σπάρτᾳ δ' ἐρέω πρὸ Κιθαιρῶνος μάχαν,
> ταῖσι Μήδειοι κάμον ἀγκυλότοξοι·
> παρὰ δὲ τὰν εὔυδρον ἀκτὰν Ἱμέρα παίδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεος
> τελέσαις
> τὸν ἐδέξαντ' ἀμφ' ἀρετᾷ πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων.
>
> (*Pyth.* I. 76.)

This is the only distinct reference that Pindar makes to the great exploit of Gelon. In the ninth Nemean he alludes to it when he prays that Sicily may be delivered from a Carthaginian invasion, and in this connexion extols the prowess of Chromius in battle. But there is, I believe, another allusion to Himera, and to Himera linked with Salamis, in a hymn earlier than either the Sicyonian ode to Chromius or the Pythian ode to Hiero. In the latest of the Isthmian odes to Phylacidas, composed not long after the year which was so memorable both in old and in new Greece, and containing the verses on the hail-storm of blood that was shed hard by the island of Ajax, occur the following lines:

> καὶ γὰρ ἐριζόμεναι
> νᾶες ἐν πόντῳ καὶ ὑφ' ἅρμασιν ἵπποι
> διὰ τεάν, ὦ 'νασσα, τιμὰν ὠκυδινάτοις ἐν ἁμίλλαισι θαυμασταὶ
> πέλονται.

Battles by sea and land are clearly meant; and when he wrote of ships striving in the sea, the poet must have chiefly thought of that recent strife in the Saronic bay which he refers to afterwards in l. 48. But the mention of war-chariots as a feature of land battles strikes one as strange. It might seem only appropriate to mythical times, but in these verses Pindar is speaking generally and is not referring to antiquity. In order to avoid the difficulty some commentators have thought that the ships meant are ships of merchandise, and the 'cars' waggons laden with wares. But ἅρματα could hardly bear such a sense.

But though war-chariots were not used by the Greeks of Pindar's day, they were used by the Carthaginians. They formed part of the equipment of the great army which sailed with Hamilcar from Carthage to Panormus. The ἅρματα of Pindar appear in Diodorus, who tells how the vessels which conveyed the cavalry and war-chariots were wrecked by a storm (XI. 20); ἀπέβαλε τῶν σκαφῶν τὰ κομίζοντα τοὺς ἱππεῖς καὶ τὰ ἅρματα. The use of war-chariots, Mr Freeman observes (*History of Sicily*, II. 185), 'Carthage would seem to have inherited from Jabin and the other warriors of the elder Canaan. Their mention now and in later times is perhaps a little startling; but they were seemingly used in the earlier Carthaginian campaigns before the elephants had been brought into use, as the chief means of breaking the ranks of the enemy'. We are justified in supposing that to a Greek of Pindar's time the mention of war-chariots would suggest the Punic manner of warfare. And Pindar's lines are quite explained if we suppose that he was thinking—and what thought would more naturally come to a Greek singing of Salamis, soon after the victory?—of the Carthaginian invasion of Sicily which was repulsed at Himera.

# INDEX I. GREEK.

# INDEX II. ENGLISH.